



Владимир Ильин

Lenin

*On Just
and
Unjust Wars*



PROGRESS Publishers · Moscow

GEMBANA PUSTAKA KENDRA

1- New Market Majlisganj

New Delhi - 700001

© Collection, Progress Publishers, 1984

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Л 0101020000-070
014(01)-84 5-84

Contents

Publishers' Note	7
From <i>The Fall of Port Arthur</i>	9
From <i>The Plan of the St. Petersburg Battle</i>	11
From <i>European Capital and the Autocracy</i>	12
From <i>The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government</i>	12
From <i>The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart</i>	13
From <i>Bellige Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy</i>	14
From <i>The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War</i>	15
From <i>The War and Russian Social-Democracy</i>	16
From <i>Lecture on "The Proletariat and the War", October 1 (14), 1914</i>	18
From <i>Under a False Flag</i>	21
From <i>The Collapse of the Second International</i>	25
From <i>Socialism and War</i>	27
On the Slogan for a United States of Europe	36
From <i>Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism</i>	39
From <i>The Junius Pamphlet</i>	40
To Alexandra Kollontai	51
From a Letter To G. Y. Zinoviev	52
Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov)	52
From <i>A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism</i>	57
From <i>The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution</i>	63
From <i>The "Disarmament" Slogan</i>	66
From a Letter To Inessa Armand	70
From <i>An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine</i>	72
From a Letter To Inessa Armand	75
From <i>The Revolution in Russia and the Tasks of the Workers of All Countries</i>	76
From <i>The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution</i>	77
From <i>The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution</i>	78
From <i>Speech in Favour of the Resolution on the War, April 27 (May 10), 1917</i>	81
From <i>War and Revolution</i>	84
From <i>The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It</i>	101
From <i>Marxism and Insurrection</i>	103
From <i>Revision of the Party Programme</i>	105
A Painful but Necessary Lesson	107

<i>Resolution on War and Peace</i>	111
From "Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality	112
<i>Prophetic Words</i>	114
Speech at a Meeting of the Warsaw Revolutionary Regiment, August 2, 1918	119
From Letter to American Workers	121
From Speech in Polytechnical Museum, August 23, 1918	130
Speech at a Meeting in the Alexeyev People's House, August 23, 1918	132
From Report at a Joint Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet, Factory Committees and Trade Unions, October 22, 1918	134
From Report of the Central Committee, March 18, Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B), March 18-23, 1919	137
From Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality, May 19, 1919	138
In Reply to Questions Put by Karl Wiegand, Berlin Correspondent of Universal Service	140
From Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution	143
From The Theses on the Agrarian Question Adopted by the Communist Party of France	145
From Political Report of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), March 27, 1922, Eleventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)	147
Notes	149
Name Index	159

Publishers' Note

This collection includes articles and excerpts from articles, speeches, reports and letters in which V. I. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, discussed the question of wars, just and unjust.

"With reference to wars," he pointed out, "the main thesis of dialectics ... is that '*war is simply the continuation of politics by other ... means*'. Such is the formula of Clausewitz.... And it was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded *any war* as the *continuation* of the politics of the powers concerned—and the *various classes* within these countries—in a definite period" (see this book, p. 25).

Lenin developed and amplified the relevant propositions of Marx and Engels and worked out a thoroughly substantiated dialectical materialist theory of war in the era of imperialism. Every war, he said, should be examined and assessed by reference to the historical setting in which it is prepared and waged. It is impossible to understand the nature of a particular war without understanding the epoch in which it takes place. In each case, one must determine the political content, "the class character of the war: what caused that war, what classes are waging it, and what historical and historico-economic conditions gave rise to it" (p. 84). The economic factors generating wars, the political ends for which they are fought, and the role of wars in the life of society being extremely diverse, a concrete analysis of every particular war is essential.

Typical of the imperialist epoch, when capitalism's inherent contradictions are exacerbated to the utmost and the disparities in economic and political development become especially pronounced, are imperialist, reactionary, unjust wars aimed at aggrandisement and the enslavement of other peoples.

All unjust wars are waged by the exploiting classes and for selfish ends: for their enrichment, for pillage and the subjection of their own and other peoples, against popular liberation movements, for preservation of obsolete, moribund social structures and reactionary political systems. Lenin stressed that there had been imperialist, aggressive, predatory wars in all societies with class antagonisms: "in the period of slavery (the war between Rome and Carthage was on both sides an imperialist war), as well as in the Middle Ages and in the epoch of mercantile capitalism" (p. 106). In the early era of imperialism, the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05 and the first world war, 1914 to 1918, were unjust wars on both sides.

In the imperialist epoch, Lenin noted, "there *may* be also 'just', 'defensive', revolutionary wars [namely (1) national, (2) civil, (3) socialist *and suchlike*]" (p. 52). Just wars are waged either to protect a nation from external attack and attempts at its enslavement, or to emancipate peoples from the yoke of capitalism, or to free colonies and dependent countries of imperialist oppression. The civil war fought by the young Soviet Republic from 1918 to 1920 against internal counter-revolution and foreign invaders who sought to restore capitalism and the monarchy in Russia was a graphic example of a just war.

Lenin showed that in the course of their evolution particular wars could change in character, with just wars turning into unjust. This happened when, as the war proceeded, other classes or social groups gained the upper hand over those that waged it at the outset. For instance, the just wars the French Republic fought in the late eighteenth century in defence of the interests of broad bourgeois and petty-bourgeois sections, against feudal reaction, grew into unjust, aggressive wars waged to further the interests of France's big bourgeoisie.

Communist parties, guided by Lenin's teaching on just and unjust wars, resolutely oppose aggressive, unjust wars and support as legitimate and just revolutionary and anti-imperialist wars of liberation. In our age, those wars are just that are fought for democracy, national independence and social progress.

The translations contained in this book are taken from Progress Publishers' edition of Lenin's *Collected Works* in 45 volumes.

From *The Fall of Port Arthur*¹

Never before has the military organisation of a country had such a close bearing on its entire economic and cultural system. The military debacle, therefore, could not but precipitate a profound political crisis. Here again, as so often in history, the war between an advanced and a backward country has played a great revolutionary role. And the class-conscious proletariat, an implacable enemy of war—this inevitable and inseverable concomitant of all class rule in general—cannot shut its eyes to the revolutionary task which the Japanese bourgeoisie, by its crushing defeat of the Russian autocracy, is carrying out. The proletariat is hostile to every bourgeoisie and to all manifestations of the bourgeois system, but this hostility does not relieve it of the duty of distinguishing between the historically progressive and the reactionary representatives of the bourgeoisie. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the most consistent and staunch representatives of revolutionary international Social-Democracy, such as Jules Guesde in France and Hyndman in England, unequivocally expressed their sympathy with Japan, which is routing the Russian autocracy. Here in Russia, of course, some socialists were found to have muddled ideas on this question, too. *Revolutionnaya Rossiya*² rebuked Guesde and Hyndman, saying that a socialist could only be in favour of a workers' Japan, a people's Japan, and not of a bourgeois Japan. This rebuke is as absurd as blaming a socialist for admitting the progressive nature of the free-trade bourgeoisie as compared with the protectionist³ bourgeoisie. Guesde and Hyndman did not defend the Japanese bourgeoisie or Japanese imperialism; they correctly noted in this conflict between two bourgeois countries the historically progressive role of one

of them. The muddle-headedness of the "Socialist-Revolutionaries"⁴ was, of course, an inevitable result of the failure on the part of our radical intelligentsia to understand the class point of view and historical materialism. Neither could the new *Iskra*⁵ help showing muddled thinking. It had quite a lot to say at first about peace at any price. It then made haste "to correct itself", when Jaurès showed plainly whose interests, those of the progressive or those of the reactionary bourgeoisie, would be served by a quasi-socialist campaign for peace in general. And now it has ended up with platitudes about the unreasonableness of "speculating" (!?) on a victory of the Japanese bourgeoisie and about war being a calamity "regardless of whether" it ends in the victory or the defeat of the autocracy.

No. The cause of Russian freedom and of the struggle of the Russian (and the world) proletariat for socialism depends to a very large extent on the military defeats of the autocracy. This cause has been greatly advanced by the military debacle which has struck terror in the hearts of all the European guardians of the existing order. The revolutionary proletariat must carry on a ceaseless agitation against war, always keeping in mind, however, that wars are inevitable as long as class rule exists. Trite phrases about peace *a la Jaurès* are of no use to the oppressed class, which is not responsible for a bourgeois war between two bourgeois nations, which is doing all it can to overthrow every bourgeoisie, which knows the enormity of the people's sufferings even in time of "peaceful" capitalist exploitation. While struggling against free competition, we cannot, however, forget its progressive character in comparison with the semi-feudal system. While struggling against every war and every bourgeoisie, we must draw a clear line in our agitational work between the progressive bourgeoisie and the feudal autocracy; we must recognise the great revolutionary role of the historic war in which the Russian worker is an involuntary participant.

It was the Russian autocracy and not the Russian people that started this colonial war, which has turned into a war between the old and the new bourgeois worlds. It is the autocratic regime and not the Russian people that has suffered ignoble defeat. The Russian people has gained from the defeat of the autocracy. The capitulation of Port Arthur is the prologue to the capitulation of tsarism. The war is not ended yet by far, but every step towards its continuation increases immeasurably the unrest and discontent among the Russian people, brings

nearer the hour of a new great war, the war of the people against the autocracy, the war of the proletariat for liberty. There is good reason for the concern shown by that most sedate and sober European bourgeoisie, which would heartily sympathise with the granting of liberal concessions by the Russian autocracy, but which stands in mortal fear of a Russian revolution, as the prologue to a European revolution.

Vpered, No. 2,
January 14 (1), 1905

Vol. 8, pp. 52-54

From *The Plan
of the St. Petersburg Battle*

It seems strange, at first glance, to refer to the peaceful march of unarmed workers to present a petition⁶ as a battle. It was a massacre. But the government had looked forward to a battle, and it doubtlessly acted according to a well-laid plan. It considered the defence of St. Petersburg and of the Winter Palace from the military standpoint. It took all necessary military measures. It removed all the civil authorities, and placed the capital with its million and a half population under the complete control of the generals (headed by Grand Duke Vladimir), who were thirsting for the blood of the people.

The government deliberately drove the proletariat to revolt, provoked it, by the massacre of unarmed people, to erect barricades, in order to drown the uprising in a sea of blood. The proletariat will learn from these military lessons afforded by the government. For one thing, it will learn the art of civil war, now that it has started the revolution. Revolution is war. Of all the wars known in history it is the only lawful, rightful, just, and truly great war. This war is not waged in the selfish interests of a handful of rulers and exploiters, like any and all other wars, but in the interests of the masses of the people against the tyrants, in the interests of the toiling and exploited millions upon millions against despotism and violence.

All detached observers now are of one accord in admitting that in Russia this war has been declared and begun. The proletariat will rise again in still greater masses....

Published in *Vpered*, No. 4,
January 31 (18), 1905

Vol. 8, p. 107

From European Capital and the Autocracy

...The proletariat struggles against war and will always struggle against it unremittingly, without, however, forgetting for a moment that war can be abolished only with the complete abolition of society's division into classes; that while class rule continues to exist war cannot be regarded only from the sentimentally democratic standpoint; that in a war between exploiting nations one must distinguish between the roles of the progressive and of the reactionary bourgeoisie of each nation. Russian Social-Democracy has had to apply these general principles of Marxism concretely to the war with Japan....

Vpervyod, No. 13,
April 5 (March 23), 1905

Vol. 8, p. 268

From The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government

...No Social-Democrat at all familiar with history, who has studied Engels, the great expert on the subject, has ever doubted the tremendous importance of military knowledge, of military technique, and of military organisation as an instrument which the masses of the people, and classes of the people, use in resolving great historical conflicts. Social-Democracy never stooped to playing at military conspiracies; it never gave prominence to military questions until the actual conditions of civil war had arisen.* But now all Social-Democrats have advanced the military questions, if not to the first place, at least to one of the first places, and they are putting great stress on studying these questions and bringing them to the knowledge of the masses. The revolutionary army must apply the military knowledge and the military means on the practical plane for the determination of the further destiny of the Russian people, for the determination of the most vital and pressing question—the question of freedom.

* Cf. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats", p. 23, on the untimeliness (in 1897) of the question concerning the methods of decisive attack upon tsarism. (First published in pamphlet form, Geneva, 1898. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 342-43.—Ed.)

Social-Democracy has never taken a sentimental view of war. It unreservedly condemns war as a bestial means of settling conflicts in human society. But Social-Democracy knows that so long as society is divided into classes, so long as there is exploitation of man by man, wars are inevitable. This exploitation cannot be destroyed without war, and war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters themselves, by the ruling and oppressing classes. There are wars and wars. There are adventurist wars, fought to further dynastic interests, to satisfy the appetite of a band of freebooters, or to attain the objects of the knights of capitalist profit. And there is another kind of war—the only war that is *legitimate* in capitalist society—war against the people's oppressors and enslavers. Only utopians and philistines can condemn such a war on principle. Only the bourgeois betrayers of freedom can stand aloof from such a war in Russia today, the war for the people's freedom. The proletariat in Russia has started that great war of liberation, and it will go on with it, forming units of a revolutionary army, reinforcing the units of the soldiers or sailors that have come over to its side, enlisting the peasants, imbuing the new *citizens* of Russia, formed and steeled in the fire of civil war, with the heroism and enthusiasm of fighters for the freedom and happiness of all mankind....

Proletary, No. 7,
July 10 (June 27), 1905

Vol. 8, pp. 565-66

From *The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart*⁷

We pass now to the last, and perhaps the most important, resolution of the Congress—that on anti-militarism. The notorious Hervé, who has made such a noise in France and Europe, advocated a semi-anarchist view by naively suggesting that every war be "answered" by a strike and an uprising. He did not understand, on the one hand, that war is a necessary product of capitalism, and that the proletariat cannot renounce participation in revolutionary wars, for such wars are possible, and have indeed occurred in capitalist societies. He did not understand, on the other hand, that the possibility of "answering" a war depends on the nature of the crisis created by that war. The choice of the means of struggle depends on these conditions; moreover, the struggle must consist (and here

we have the third misconception, or shallow thinking of Hervéism) not simply in replacing war by peace, but in replacing capitalism by socialism. The essential thing is not merely to prevent war, but to utilise the crisis created by war in order to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. However, underlying all these semi-anarchist absurdities of Hervéism there was one sound and practical purpose: to spur the socialist movement so that it will not be restricted to parliamentary methods of struggle alone, so that the masses will realise the need for revolutionary action in connection with the crises which war inevitably involves, so that, lastly, a more lively understanding of international labour solidarity and of the falsity of bourgeois patriotism will be spread among the masses....

Written at the end of August
and beginning of September 1907

Vol. 13, pp. 79-80

From Bellicose Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy

It is obvious that on this question (just as in discussing “patriotism”) it is not the defensive or offensive character of the war, but the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat, or—to put it better—the interests of the international movement of the proletariat—that represent the sole criterion for considering and deciding the attitude of the Social-Democrats to any particular event in international relations.

The lengths to which opportunism can go in such questions too is shown by a recent statement of Jaurès. Expressing his views on the international situation in a German bourgeois-liberal newspaper, he defends the alliance of France and Britain with Russia against the charge of non-peaceful intentions, and treats that alliance as a “guarantee of peace”; he welcomes the fact that “we have now lived to see an alliance of Britain and Russia, two old-standing enemies”.

Rosa Luxemburg has given a magnificent assessment of such a view, and a warm retort to Jaurès, in her “Open Letter” to him in the last issue of *Neue Zeit*.⁸

Rosa Luxemburg begins by pointing out that to talk of an alliance between “Russia” and “Britain” means “talking in the language of bourgeois politicians”, because the interests

of the capitalist states and the interests of the proletariat in foreign policy are opposed to one another, and one cannot speak of a harmony of interests in the sphere of foreign relations. If militarism is the offspring of capitalism, then wars too cannot be abolished by the intrigues of rulers and diplomats; and the task of socialists is not to awaken illusions on this score, but on the contrary constantly to expose the hypocrisy and impotence of diplomatic "peaceful démarches"....

Proletary, No. 33,
July 23 (August 5), 1908

Vol. 15, pp. 199-200

*From The Tasks
of Revolutionary Social-Democracy
in the European War*

**The Russian Social-Democrats
on the European War⁹**

Resolution of a Group of Social-Democrats

1. The European and world war has the clearly defined character of a bourgeois, imperialist and dynastic war. A struggle for markets and for freedom to loot foreign countries, a striving to suppress the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and democracy in the individual countries, a desire to deceive, disunite, and slaughter the proletarians of all countries by setting the wage slaves of one nation against those of another so as to benefit the bourgeoisie—these are the only real content and significance of the war....

5. With reference to the bourgeois and chauvinist sophisms being used by the bourgeois parties and the governments of the two chief rival nations of the Continent—the German and the French—to fool the masses most effectively, and being copied by both the overt and covert socialist opportunists, who are slavishly following in the wake of the bourgeoisie, one must particularly note and brand the following:

When the German bourgeois refer to the defence of the fatherland and to the struggle against tsarism, and insist on the freedom of cultural and national development, they are lying, because it has always been the policy of Prussian Junkerdom,¹⁰ headed by Wilhelm II, and the big bourgeoisie of Germany, to defend the tsarist monarchy; whatever the outcome of the war, they are sure to try to bolster it. They are

lying because, in actual fact, the Austrian bourgeoisie have launched a robber campaign against Serbia, and the German bourgeoisie are oppressing Danes, Poles, and Frenchmen (in Alsace-Lorraine); they are waging a war of aggression against Belgium and France so as to loot the richer and freer countries; they have organised an offensive at a moment which seemed best for the use of the latest improvements in military matériel, and on the eve of the introduction of the so-called big military programme in Russia.

Similarly, when the French bourgeois refer to the defence of the fatherland, etc., they are lying, because in actual fact they are defending countries that are backward in capitalist technology and are developing more slowly, and because they spend thousands of millions to hire Russian tsarism's Black-Hundred gangs for a war of aggression, i.e., the looting of Austrian and German lands.

Neither of the two belligerent groups of nations is second to the other in cruelty and atrocities in warfare....

Written not later than August 24
(September 6), 1914

Vol. 21, pp. 15-16, 17-18

From *The War and Russian Social-Democracy*

The European war, which the governments and the bourgeois parties of all countries have been preparing for decades, has broken out. The growth of armaments, the extreme intensification of the struggle for markets in the latest—the imperialist—stage of capitalist development in the advanced countries, and the dynastic interests of the more backward East-European monarchies were inevitably bound to bring about this war, and have done so. Seizure of territory and subjugation of other nations, the ruining of competing nations and the plunder of their wealth, distracting the attention of the working masses from the internal political crises in Russia, Germany, Britain and other countries, disuniting and nationalist stultification of the workers, and the extermination of their vanguard so as to weaken the revolutionary movement of the proletariat—these comprise the sole actual content, importance and significance of the present war.

It is primarily on Social-Democracy that the duty rests of revealing the true meaning of the war, and of ruthlessly

exposing the falsehood, sophistry and "patriotic" phrase-mongering spread by the ruling classes, the landowners and the bourgeoisie, in defence of the war.

One group of belligerent nations is headed by the German bourgeoisie. It is hoodwinking the working class and the toiling masses by asserting that this is a war in defence of the fatherland, freedom and civilisation, for the liberation of the peoples oppressed by tsarism, and for the destruction of reactionary tsarism. In actual fact, however, this bourgeoisie, which servilely grovels to the Prussian Junkers, headed by Wilhelm II, has always been a most faithful ally of tsarism, and an enemy of the revolutionary movement of Russia's workers and peasants. In fact, whatever the outcome of the war, this bourgeoisie will, together with the Junkers, exert every effort to support the tsarist monarchy against a revolution in Russia.

In fact, the German bourgeoisie has launched a robber campaign against Serbia, with the object of subjugating her and throttling the national revolution of the Southern Slavs, at the same time sending the bulk of its military forces against the freer countries, Belgium and France, so as to plunder richer competitors. In fact, the German bourgeoisie, which has been spreading the fable that it is waging a war of defence, chose the moment it thought most favourable for war, making use of its latest improvements in military matériel and forestalling the rearmament already planned and decided upon by Russia and France.

The other group of belligerent nations is headed by the British and the French bourgeoisie, who are hoodwinking the working class and the toiling masses by asserting that they are waging a war for the defence of their countries, for freedom and civilisation and against German militarism and despotism. In actual fact, this bourgeoisie has long been spending thousands of millions to hire the troops of Russian tsarism, the most reactionary and barbarous monarchy in Europe, and prepare them for an attack on Germany.

In fact, the struggle of the British and the French bourgeoisie is aimed at the seizure of the German colonies, and the ruining of a rival nation, whose economic development has been more rapid. In pursuit of this noble aim, the "advanced" "democratic" nations are helping the savage tsarist regime to still more throttle Poland, the Ukraine, etc., and more thoroughly crush the revolution in Russia.

Neither group of belligerents is inferior to the other in spoliation, atrocities and the boundless brutality of war; however, to hoodwink the proletariat and distract its attention from the only genuine war of liberation, namely, a civil war against the bourgeoisie both of its "own" and of "foreign" countries—to achieve so lofty an aim—the bourgeoisie of each country is trying, with the help of false phrases about patriotism, to extol the significance of its "own" national war, asserting that it is out to defeat the enemy, not for plunder and the seizure of territory, but for the "liberation" of all other peoples except its own.

But the harder the governments and the bourgeoisie of all countries try to disunite the workers and pit them against one another, and the more savagely they enforce, for this lofty aim, martial law and the military censorship (measures which even now, in wartime, are applied against the "internal" foe more harshly than against the external), the more presagingly is it the duty of the class-conscious proletariat to defend its class solidarity, its internationalism, and its socialist convictions against the unbridled chauvinism of the "patriotic" bourgeois cliques in all countries. If class-conscious workers were to give up this aim, this would mean renunciation of their aspirations for freedom and democracy, to say nothing of their socialist aspirations....

Written prior to September 28
(October 11), 1914

Vol. 21, pp. 27-29

From *Lecture on "The Proletariat and the War"*, October 1 (14), 1914
Newspaper Report

The speaker divided his lecture into two parts: clarifying the nature of the present war, and the attitude of socialists to the war.

For a Marxist clarifying the nature of the war is a necessary preliminary for deciding the question of his attitude to it. But for such a clarification it is essential, first and foremost, to establish the objective conditions and concrete circumstances of the war in question. It is necessary to consider the war in the historical environment in which it is taking place, only then can one determine one's attitude to it. Otherwise, the resulting interpretation will be not materialist but eclectic.

Depending on the historical circumstances, the relationship of classes, etc., the attitude to war must be different at different times. It is absurd once and for all to renounce participation in war in principle. On the other hand, it is also absurd to divide wars into defensive and aggressive. In 1848, Marx hated Russia, because at that time democracy in Germany could not win out and develop, or unite the country into a single national whole, so long as the reactionary hand of backward Russia hung heavy over her.

In order to clarify one's attitude to the present war, one must understand how it differs from previous wars, and what its peculiar features are.

Has the bourgeoisie given such an explanation? No. Far from having given one, it will not manage to give one in any circumstances. Judging by what is going on among the socialists, one might think that they, too, have no idea of the distinctive features of the present war.

Yet, the socialists have given an excellent explanation of it, and have predicted it. More than that, there is not a single speech by a socialist deputy, not a single article by a socialist publicist, that does not contain that explanation. It is so simple that people somehow do not take notice of it, and yet it provides the key to the correct attitude to the present war.

The present war is an imperialist one, and that is its basic feature.

In order to clarify this, it is necessary to examine the nature of previous wars, and that of the imperialist war.

Lenin dwelt in considerable detail on the characteristics of wars at the end of the 18th and during the whole of the 19th centuries. They were all *national wars*, which accompanied and promoted the creation of national states.

These wars marked the destruction of feudalism, and were an expression of the struggle of the new, bourgeois society against feudal society. The national state was a necessary phase in the development of capitalism. The struggle for the self-determination of a nation, for its independence, for freedom to use its language, for popular representation, served this end—the creation of national states, that ground necessary at a certain stage of capitalism for the development of the productive forces.

Such was the character of wars from the time of the great French Revolution up to and including the Italian and Prussian wars.

This task of the national wars was performed either by

democracy itself or with the help of Bismarck, quite independently of the will and the consciousness of those who took part in them. The triumph of present-day civilisation, the full flowering of capitalism, the drawing of the whole people and of all nations into capitalism—that was the outcome of national wars, the wars at the beginning of capitalism.

An imperialist war is quite a different matter. On this point, there was no disagreement among the socialists of all countries and all trends. At all congresses, in discussing resolutions on the attitude to a possible war, everyone was always agreed that this war would be an *imperialist one*. All European countries have already reached an equal stage in the development of capitalism, all of them have already yielded everything that capitalism can yield. Capitalism has already attained its highest form, and is no longer exporting commodities, but capital. It is beginning to find its national framework too small for it, and now the struggle is on for the last free scraps of the earth. If national wars in the 18th and 19th centuries marked the beginning of capitalism, imperialist wars point to its end.

The whole end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century were filled with imperialist policy.

Imperialism is what impresses a quite specific stamp on the present war, distinguishing it from all its predecessors.

Only by examining this war in its distinctive historical environment, as a Marxist must do, can we clarify our attitude to it. Otherwise we shall be operating with old conceptions and arguments, applied to a different, an old situation. Among such obsolete conceptions are the fatherland idea and the division, mentioned earlier, of wars into defensive and aggressive.

Of course, even now there are blotches of the old colour in the living picture of reality. Thus, of all the warring countries, the Serbs alone are still fighting for national existence. In India and China, too, class-conscious proletarians could not take any other path but the national one, because their countries have not yet been formed into national states. If China had to carry on an offensive war for this purpose, we could only sympathise with her, because objectively it would be a progressive war. In exactly the same way, Marx in 1848 could call for an offensive war against Russia.

And so the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th are characterised by imperialist policy.

Imperialism is that state of capitalism when, having done

all that it could, it turns towards decline. It is a special epoch, not in the minds of socialists, but in actual relationships. A struggle is on for a division of the remaining portions. It is the last historical task of capitalism. We cannot say how long this epoch will last. There may well be several such wars, but there must be a clear understanding that these are quite different wars from those waged earlier, and that, accordingly, the tasks facing socialists have changed.

To tackle these new tasks the proletarian party may need organisations of a very different type.

Vol. 36, pp. 297-300

From *Under a False Flag*

...The usual division into historical epochs, so often cited in Marxist literature and so many times repeated by Kautsky and adopted in Potresov's article, is the following: (1) 1789-1871; (2) 1871-1914; (3) 1914—? Here, of course, as everywhere in Nature and society, the lines of division are conventional and variable, relative, not absolute. We take the most outstanding and striking historical events only approximately, as milestones in important historical movements. The first epoch from the Great French Revolution to the Franco-Prussian war¹¹ is one of the rise of the bourgeoisie, of its triumph, of the bourgeoisie on the upgrade, an epoch of bourgeois-democratic movements in general and of bourgeois-national movements in particular, an epoch of the rapid breakdown of the obsolete feudal-absolute institutions. The second epoch is that of the full domination and decline of the bourgeoisie, one of transition from its progressive character towards reactionary and even ultra-reactionary finance capital. This is an epoch in which a new class—present-day democracy—is preparing and slowly mustering its forces. The third epoch, which has just set in, places the bourgeoisie in the same “position” as that in which the feudal lords found themselves during the first epoch. This is the epoch of imperialism and imperialist upheavals, as well as of upheavals stemming from the nature of imperialism.

It was none other than Kautsky who, in a series of articles and in his pamphlet *Der Weg zur Macht* (which appeared in 1909), outlined with full clarity the basic features of the third epoch that has set in, and who noted the fundamental differ-

ences between this epoch and the second (that of yesterday), and recognised the change in the immediate tasks as well as in the conditions and forms of struggle of present-day democracy, a change stemming from the changed objective historical conditions. Kautsky is now burning that which he worshipped yesterday; his change of front is most incredible, most unbecoming and most shameless. In the above-mentioned pamphlet, he spoke forthrightly of symptoms of an approaching war, and specifically of the kind of war that became a fact in 1914. It would suffice simply to place side by side for comparison a number of passages from that pamphlet and from his present writings to show convincingly how Kautsky has betrayed his own convictions and solemn declarations. In this respect Kautsky is not an individual instance (or even a German instance); he is a typical representative of the entire upper crust of present-day democracy, which, at a moment of crisis, has deserted to the side of the bourgeoisie.

All the historical instances quoted by Potresov and Kautsky belong to the first epoch. The main objective content of the historical wartime phenomena, not only of 1855, 1859, 1864, 1866, or 1870, but also of 1877 (the Russo-Turkish war) and 1896-1897 (the wars between Turkey and Greece and the Armenian disturbances) were bourgeois-national movements or "convulsions" in a bourgeois society ridding itself of every kind of feudalism. At that time there could have been no possibility of really independent action by present-day democracy, action of the kind befitting the epoch of the over-maturity and decay of the bourgeoisie, in a number of leading countries. The bourgeoisie was then the chief class, which was on the upgrade as a result of its participation in those wars; it alone could come out with overwhelming force against the feudal-absolutist institutions. Represented by various strata of *propertied* producers of commodities, this bourgeoisie was progressive in various degrees in the different countries, sometimes (like part of the Italian bourgeoisie in 1859) being even revolutionary. The general feature of the epoch, however, was the progressiveness of the bourgeoisie, i.e., its unresolved and uncompleted struggle against feudalism. It was perfectly natural for the elements of present-day democracy, and for Marx as their representative, to have been guided at the time by the unquestionable principle of support for the progressive bourgeoisie (i. e., capable of waging a struggle) against feudalism, and for them to be dealing with the problem as to "the success of which side", i.e., of which bourgeoisie, was more

desirable. The popular movement in the principal countries affected by the war was generally democratic at that time, i.e., bourgeois-democratic in its economic and class content. It is quite natural that *no other* question could have been posed at the time except the following: the success of which bourgeoisie, the success of which combination of forces, the failure of which reactionary forces (the feudal-absolutist forces which were hampering the rise of the bourgeoisie) promised contemporary democracy more "elbow room".

As even Potresov has had to admit, Marx was guided, in his "appraisal" of international conflicts springing from bourgeois national and liberation movements, by considerations as to whose success was more capable of contributing to the "development" (p. 74 of Potresov's article) of national and, in general, popular democratic movements. That means that, during military conflicts stemming from the bourgeoisie's rise to power within the various nationalities, Marx was, as in 1848, most of all concerned with extending the scope of the bourgeois-democratic movement and bringing it to a head through the participation of broader and more plebeian" masses, the petty bourgeoisie in general, the peasantry in particular, and finally of the poor classes as a whole. This concern of Marx for the extension of the movement's social base and its development is the fundamental distinction between Marx's consistently democratic tactics and Lassalle's inconsistent tactics, which veered towards an alliance with the national-liberals.

The international conflicts in the third epoch have, in *form*, remained the same kind of international conflicts as those of the first epoch, but their social and class *content* has changed radically. The objective historical situation has grown quite different.

The place of the struggle of a rising capital, striving towards national liberation from feudalism, has been taken by the struggle waged against the new forces by the most reactionary finance capital, the struggle of a force that has exhausted and outlived itself and is heading downward towards decay. The bourgeois-national state framework, which in the first epoch was the mainstay of the *development* of the productive forces of humanity that was liberating itself from feudalism, has now, in the third epoch, become a *hindrance* to the further development of the productive forces. From a rising and progressive class the bourgeoisie has turned into a declining, decadent, and reactionary class. It is quite another

er class that is now on the upgrade on a broad historical scale.

Potresov and Kautsky have abandoned the standpoint of that class; they have turned back, repeating the false bourgeois assertion that *today too* the objective content of the historical process consists in the bourgeoisie's progressive movement against feudalism. In reality, there can now be no talk of *present-day* democracy following in the wake of the *reactionary* imperialist bourgeoisie, no matter of what "shade" the latter may be.

In the first epoch, the objective and historical task was to ascertain how, in its struggle against the *chief* representatives of a dying feudalism, the progressive bourgeoisie should "utilise" international conflicts so as to bring the greatest possible advantage to the entire democratic bourgeoisie of the world. In the first epoch, over half a century ago, it was natural and inevitable that the bourgeoisie, enslaved by feudalism, should wish the defeat of its "own" feudal oppressor, all the more so that the principal and central feudal strongholds of all-European importance were not so numerous at the time. This is how Marx "appraised" the conflicts: he ascertained in which country, in a given and concrete situation, the success of the bourgeois-liberation movement was more *important* in undermining the *all-European* feudal stronghold.

At present, in the third epoch, no feudal fortresses of all-European significance remain. Of course, it is the task of present-day democracy to "utilise" conflicts, but—despite Potresov and Kautsky—this *international* utilisation must be directed, not against individual national finance capital, but against international finance capital. The utilisation should not be effected by a class which was on the ascendant fifty or a hundred years ago. At that time it was a question of "international action" (Potresov's expression) by the most advanced bourgeois democracy; today it is another class that is confronted by a similar task created by history and advanced by the objective state of affairs....

Written not earlier than
February 1915

Vol. 21, pp. 146-50

From *The Collapse of the Second International*¹²

...With reference to wars, the main thesis of dialectics, which has been so shamelessly distorted by Plekhanov to please the bourgeoisie, is that "*war is simply the continuation of politics by other [i.e., violent] means*". Such is the formula of Clausewitz,* one of the greatest writers on the history of war, whose thinking was stimulated by Hegel. And it was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded *any* war as the *continuation* of the politics of the powers concerned—and the *various classes* within these countries—in a definite period.

Plekhanov's crude chauvinism is based on exactly the same theoretical stand as the more subtle and saccharo-conciliatory chauvinism of Kautsky, who uses the following arguments when he gives his blessing to the desertion of the socialists of all countries to the side of their "own" capitalists:

It is the right and duty of everyone to defend his fatherland; true internationalism consists in this right being recognised for the socialists of all nations, including those who are at war with my nation.... (See *Die Neue Zeit*, October 2, 1914, and other works by the same author.)

This matchless reasoning is such an unutterable travesty of socialism that the best answer to it would be to strike a medal with the portraits of Wilhelm II and Nicholas II on one side and of Plekhanov and Kautsky on the other. True internationalism, we are told, means that we must justify German workers firing at French workers, and French workers firing at German workers, in the name of "defence of the fatherland"!

However, closer examination of the theoretical premises in Kautsky's reasoning will reveal the selfsame idea that Clausewitz ridiculed about eighty years ago, viz., that when war breaks out, all historically created political relations between nations and classes cease and that a totally new situation arises! There are "simply" those that attack and those that are defending themselves, "simply" the warding off of the

* Karl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege*, Werke, I. Bd., S. 28. Cf. III. Bd., S. 139-40: "All know that wars are caused only by the political relations of governments and of nations; but ordinarily one pictures the situation as if, with the beginning of the war, these relations cease and a totally new situation is created, which follows its own laws. We assert, on the contrary, that war is nothing but the continuation of political relations, with the intervention of other means."

"enemies of the fatherland"! The oppression of a number of nations which comprise over half the population of the globe, by the dominant imperialist nations; the rivalry between the bourgeoisie of these countries for a share of the loot; the desire of the capitalists to split and suppress the working-class movement—all these have suddenly disappeared from the ken of Plekhanov and Kautsky, although they themselves were describing these very "politics" for decades before the war.

In this connection, false references to Marx and Engels are the crowning argument of these two chieftains of social-chauvinism; Plekhanov recalls Prussia's national war of 1813 and Germany's national war of 1870, while Kautsky argues, with a most learned air, that Marx examined the question of whose success (i.e., the success of which bourgeoisie) was more desirable in the wars of 1854-55, 1859 and 1870-71, and that the Marxists did likewise in the wars of 1876-77 and 1897. In all times the sophists have been in the habit of citing instances that refer to situations that are dissimilar in principle. The wars of the past, to which they make references, were a "continuation of the politics" of the bourgeoisie's national movements of many years' standing, movements against an alien yoke and against absolutism (Turkish or Russian). At that time the only question was: the success of which bourgeoisie was to be preferred; for wars of this type, the Marxists could *rouse* the peoples *in advance*, *fostering* national hatred, as Marx did in 1848 and later, when he called for a war against Russia, and as Engels in 1859 fostered German national hatred of their oppressors—Napoleon III and Russian tsarism.*

Comparing the "continuation of the politics" of combating feudalism and absolutism—the politics of the bourgeoisie in its struggle for liberty—with the "continuation of the

* Mr. Gardenin in *Zhizn*¹³ labels as "revolutionary chauvinism"—but chauvinism—Marx's stand in 1848 for revolutionary war against the European nations which in fact had shown themselves to be counter-revolutionary, viz., "the Slavs and the Russians in particular". This reproof of Marx reveals once again the opportunism (or—properly speaking *and*—the inconstancy) of this "Left" Socialist-Revolutionary. We Marxists have always stood, and still stand, for a *revolutionary* war against *counter-revolutionary* nations. For instance, if socialism is *victorious* in America or in Europe in 1920, and Japan and China, let us say, *then* move their Bismarcks against us—if only diplomatically at first—we certainly would be *in favour* of an offensive revolutionary war against them. It seems strange to you, Mr. Gardenin? But then you are a revolutionary of the Ropshin type!

politics" of a decrepit, i.e., imperialist, bourgeoisie, i.e., of a bourgeoisie which has plundered the entire world, a reactionary bourgeoisie which, in alliance with feudal landlords, attempts to crush the proletariat, means comparing chalk and cheese. It is like comparing the "representatives of the bourgeoisie", Robespierre, Garibaldi and Zhelyabov, with such "representatives of the bourgeoisie" as Millerand, Salandra and Guchkov. One cannot be a Marxist without feeling the deepest respect for the great bourgeois revolutionaries who had an historic right to speak for their respective bourgeois "fatherlands", and, in the struggle against feudalism, led tens of millions of people in the new nations towards a civilised life. Neither can one be a Marxist without feeling contempt for the sophistry of Plekhanov and Kautsky, who speak of the "defence of the fatherland" with regard to the throttling of Belgium by the German imperialists, or with regard to the pact between the imperialists of Britain, France, Russia and Italy on the plundering of Austria and Turkey.

Written in the second half of May
and the first half of June 1915

Vol. 21, pp. 219-21

From Socialism and War

The Attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. Towards the War

Chapter I

The Principles of Socialism and the War of 1914-1915

The Attitude of Socialists Towards Wars

Socialists have always condemned wars between nations as barbarous and brutal. Our attitude towards war, however, is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within a country; we understand that wars cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and socialism is created; we also differ in that we regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by an oppressed class against the oppressor class, by slaves against slave-holders, by serfs against landowners, and by wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as fully legitimate, progressive and

necessary. We Marxists differ from both pacifists and anarchists in that we deem it necessary to study each war historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) and separately. There have been in the past numerous wars which, despite all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy most harmful and reactionary institutions (e.g., an autocracy or serfdom) and the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (the Turkish and the Russian). That is why the features historically specific to the present war must come up for examination.

The Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times

The Great French Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. From that time down to the Paris Commune, i.e., between 1789 and 1871, one type of war was of a bourgeois-progressive character, waged for national liberation. In other words, the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, and the overthrow of alien oppression, formed the chief content and historical significance of such wars. These were therefore progressive wars; during *such* wars, all honest and revolutionary democrats, as well as all socialists, always wished success to that country (i.e., that bourgeoisie) which had helped to overthrow or undermine the most baneful foundations of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of other nations. For example, the revolutionary wars waged by France contained an element of plunder and the conquest of foreign territory by the French, but this does not in the least alter the fundamental historical significance of those wars, which destroyed and shattered feudalism and absolutism in the whole of the old, serf-owning Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France but this does not alter the fundamental historical significance of that war, which liberated tens of millions of German people from feudal disunity and from the oppression of two despots, the Russian tsar and Napoleon III.

The Difference Between Wars of Aggression and of Defence

The period of 1789-1871 left behind it deep marks and revolutionary memories. There could be no development of the proletarian struggle for socialism prior to the overthrow of feudalism, absolutism and alien oppression. When, in speaking of the wars of such periods, socialists stressed the legitimacy of "defensive" wars, they always had these aims in mind, namely revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By a "defensive" war socialists have always understood a "just" war in this particular sense (Wilhelm Liebknecht once expressed himself precisely in this way). It is only in this sense that socialists have always regarded wars "for the defence of the fatherland", or "defensive" wars, as legitimate, progressive and just. For example, if tomorrow, Morocco were to declare war on France, or India on Britain, or Persia or China on Russia, and so on, these would be "just", and "defensive" wars *irrespective* of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory "Great" Powers.

But imagine a slave-holder who owns 100 slaves warring against another who owns 200 slaves, for a more "just" redistribution of slaves. The use of the term of a "defensive" war, or a war "for the defence of the fatherland", would clearly be historically false in such a case and would in practice be sheer deception of the common people, philistines, and the ignorant, by the astute slave-holders. It is in this way that the peoples are being deceived with "national" ideology and the term of "defence of the fatherland", by the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie, in the war now being waged between slave-holders with the purpose of consolidating slavery.

The War of Today Is an Imperialist War

It is almost universally admitted that this war is an imperialist war. In most cases, however, this term is distorted, or applied to one side, or else a loophole is left for the assertion that this war may, after all, be bourgeois-progressive, and of significance to the national-liberation movement. Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached

only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds that the old national states, without whose formation it could not have overthrown feudalism, are too cramped for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a degree that entire branches of industry are controlled by syndicates, trusts and associations of capitalist multimillionaires and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the "lords of capital" either in the form of colonies, or by entangling other countries in thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superseded by a striving towards monopolies, the seizure of territory for the investment of capital and as sources of raw materials, and so on. From the liberator of nations, which it was in the struggle against feudalism, capitalism in its imperialist stage has turned into the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has become reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alternative of adopting socialism or of experiencing years and even decades of armed struggle between the "Great" Powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind.

*A War Between the Biggest Slave-Holders
for the Maintenance and Consolidation of
Slavery*

To make the significance of imperialism clear, we will quote precise figures showing the partition of the world among the so-called "Great" Powers (i.e., those successful in great plunder). (See table on p. 31.)

Hence it will be seen that, since 1876, most of the nations which were foremost fighters for freedom in 1789-1871, have, on the basis of a highly developed and "over-mature" capitalism, become oppressors and enslavers of most of the population and the nations of the globe. From 1876 to 1914, six "Great" Powers grabbed 25 million square kilometres, i.e., an area two and a half times that of Europe! Six Powers have enslaved 523 million people in the colonies. For every four inhabitants in the "Great" Powers there are five in "their" colonies. It is common knowledge that colonies are conquered with fire and sword, that the population of the colonies are brutally treated, and that they are exploited in a thousand ways (by exporting capital, through concessions,

**Partition of the World Among
the "Great" Slave-holding Powers**

"Great" Powers	Colonies				Metropolis		Total	
	1876		1914		1914			
	Square kilo- metres	Population millions	Square kilo- metres	Population millions	Square kilo- metres	Population millions	Square kilo- metres	Population millions
Britain	22.5	251.9	33.5	393.5	0.3	46.5	33.8	440.0
Russia	17.0	15.9	17.4	33.2	5.4	136.2	22.8	169.4
France	0.9	6.0	10.6	55.5	0.5	39.6	11.1	95.1
Germany	—	—	2.9	12.3	0.5	64.9	3.4	77.2
Japan	—	—	0.3	19.2	0.4	53.0	0.7	72.2
United States of America	—	—	0.3	9.7	9.4	97.0	9.7	106.7
Total for the six "Great" Powers	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	16.5	437.2	81.5	960.6
Colonies belonging to <i>other</i> than Great Powers (Belgium, Hol- land and other states)		9.9	45.3			9.9	45.3	
Three "semi-colonial" countries (Turkey, China and Persia)					14.5	361.2		
					105.9	1,367.1		
Other states and countries					28.0	289.9		
Entire globe (exclusive of Arctic and Antarctic regions)							133.9	1,657.0

etc., cheating in the sale of goods, submission to the authorities of the "ruling" nation, and so on and so forth). The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are deceiving the people when they say that they are waging a war for the freedom of nations and

of Belgium; in fact they are waging a war for the purpose of retaining the colonies they have grabbed and robbed. The German imperialists would free Belgium, etc., at once if the British and French would agree to "fairly" share their colonies with them. A feature of the situation is that in this war the fate of the colonies is being decided by a war on the Continent. From the standpoint of bourgeois justice and national freedom (or the right of nations to existence), Germany might be considered absolutely in the right as against Britain and France, for she has been "done out" of colonies, her enemies are oppressing an immeasurably far larger number of nations than she is, and the Slavs that are being oppressed by her ally, Austria, undoubtedly enjoy far more freedom than those of tsarist Russia, that veritable "prison of nations". Germany, however, is fighting, not for the liberation of nations, but for their oppression. It is not the business of socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to plunder the older and overgorged robbers. Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow all of them. To be able to do this, socialists must first of all tell the people the truth, namely, that this war is, in three respects, a war between slave-holders with the aim of consolidating slavery. This is a war, firstly, to increase the enslavement of the colonies by means of a "more equitable" distribution and subsequent more concerted exploitation of them; secondly, to increase the oppression of other nations within the "Great" Powers, since *both* Austria and Russia (Russia in greater degree and with results far worse than Austria) maintain their rule only by such oppression, intensifying it by means of war; and thirdly, to increase and prolong wage slavery, since the proletariat is split up and suppressed, while the capitalists are the gainers, making fortunes out of the war, fanning national prejudices and intensifying reaction, which has raised its head in all countries, even in the freest and most republican.

*"War Is the Continuation
of Politics by Other" (i.e.: Violent) "Means"*

This famous dictum was uttered by Clausewitz, one of the profoundest writers on the problems of war. Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views on the significance of any war. It was from this

viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded the various wars.

Apply this view to the present war. You will see that for decades, for almost half a century, the governments and the ruling classes of Britain and France, Germany and Italy, Austria and Russia have pursued a policy of plundering colonies, oppressing other nations, and suppressing the working-class movement. It is this, and only this, policy that is being continued in the present war. In particular, the policy of both Austria and Russia, in peacetime as well as in wartime, is a policy of enslaving nations, not of liberating them. In China, Persia, India and other dependent countries, on the contrary, we have seen during the past decades a policy of rousing tens and hundreds of millions of people to a national life, of their liberation from the reactionary "Great" Powers' oppression. A war waged on such a historical basis can even today be a bourgeois-progressive war of national liberation.

If the present war is regarded as a continuation of the politics of the "Great" Powers and of the principal classes within them, a glance will immediately reveal the glaring anti-historicity, falseness and hypocrisy of the view that the "defence-of-the-fatherland" idea can be justified in the present war.

The Case of Belgium

The favourite plea of the social-chauvinists of the Triple (now Quadruple) Entente¹⁴ (in Russia, Plekhanov and Co.) is the case of Belgium. This instance, however, speaks against them. The German imperialists have brazenly violated the neutrality of Belgium, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon *all* treaties and obligations if necessary. Let us suppose that all states interested in the observance of international treaties should declare war on Germany with the demand that Belgium be liberated and indemnified. In that case, the sympathies of socialists would, of course, be with Germany's enemies. But the whole point is that the Triple (and Quadruple) Entente is waging war, *not* over Belgium: this is common knowledge and only hypocrites will disguise the fact. Britain is grabbing at Germany's colonies and Turkey; Russia is grabbing at Galicia and Turkey, France wants Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty has been concluded with Italy for the division of the

spoils (Albania and Asia Minor); bargaining is going on with Bulgaria and Rumania, also for the division of the spoils. In the present war waged by the governments of today, it is *impossible* to help Belgium *otherwise* than by helping to throttle Austria or Turkey, etc.! Where does "defence of the fatherland" come in here? Herein lies the specific feature of imperialist war, a war between reactionary-bourgeois and historically outmoded governments, waged for the purpose of oppressing other nations. Whoever justifies participation in the present war is perpetuating the imperialist oppression of nations. Whoever advocates taking advantage of the present embarrassments of the governments so as to fight for the social revolution is championing the real freedom of really all nations, which is possible only under socialism.

The Basle Manifesto

The Manifesto on war unanimously adopted in Basle in 1912 has in view the very kind of war between Britain and Germany and their present allies, which broke out in 1914. The Manifesto openly declares that no interests of the people can serve to justify such a war waged "for the sake of the profits of the capitalists and the ambitions of dynasties", on the basis of the imperialist, predatory policy of the Great Powers. The Manifesto openly declares that war is dangerous to "governments" (all of them without exception), notes their fear of "a proletarian revolution", and very definitely points to the example set by the Commune of 1871, and by October-December 1905,¹⁵ i.e., *to the examples of revolution and civil war*. Thus, the Basle Manifesto lays down, precisely for the present war, the tactics of the workers' revolutionary struggle on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the words in the Stuttgart resolution that, in the event of war, socialists must take advantage of the "economic and political crisis" it will cause so as to "hasten the downfall of capitalism", i.e., take advantage of the governments' wartime difficulties and the indignation of the masses, to advance the socialist revolution.

The social-chauvinists' policy, their justification of the war from the bourgeois-liberation standpoint, their sanctioning of "defence of the fatherland", their voting for credits, membership in governments, and so on and so forth, are

downright treachery to socialism, which can be explained only, as we will soon show, by the victory of opportunism and of the national liberal-labour policy in the majority of European parties.

False References to Marx and Engels

The Russian social-chauvinists (headed by Plekhanov) make references to Marx's tactics in the war of 1870; the German (of the type of Lensch, David and Co.)—to Engels's statement in 1891 that, in the event of war against Russia and France combined, it would be the duty of the German socialists to defend their fatherland; finally, the social-chauvinists of the Kautsky type, who want to reconcile and legitimatise international chauvinism, refer to the fact that Marx and Engels, while condemning war, nevertheless, from 1854-55 to 1870-71 and 1876-77, always took the side of one belligerent state or another, once war had broken out.

All these references are outrageous distortions of the views of Marx and Engels, in the interest of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, in just the same way as the writings of the anarchists Guillaume and Co. distort the views of Marx and Engels so as to justify anarchism. The war of 1870-71 was historically progressive on the part of Germany, until Napoleon III was defeated: the latter, together with the tsar,* had oppressed Germany for years, keeping her in a state of feudal disunity. But as soon as the war developed into the plundering of France (the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels emphatically condemned the Germans. Even at the beginning of the war, Marx and Engels approved of the refusal of Bebel and Liebknecht to vote for war credits, and advised Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to uphold the independent class interests of the proletariat. To apply to the present imperialist war the appraisal of this bourgeois-progressive war of national liberation is a mockery of the truth. The same applies with still greater force to the war of 1854-55, and to all the wars of the nineteenth century, when there existed *no* modern imperialism, *no* mature objective conditions for socialism, and *no* mass socialist parties *in any* of the belligerent countries, i.e., none of the conditions from which the Basle Manifesto deduced the tactics of a "proletarian

* Alexander II.—Ed.

revolution" *in connection* with a war between Great Powers.

Anyone who today refers to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the *progressive* bourgeoisie, and forgets Marx's statement that "the workingmen have no country"—a statement that applies *precisely* to the period of the reactionary and outmoded bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, is shamelessly distorting Marx, and is substituting the bourgeois point of view for the socialist....

Written in July-August 1915

Vol. 21, pp. 299-306, 307-09

On the Slogan for a United States of Europe

In No. 40 of *Sotsial-Demokrat*¹⁶ we reported that a conference of our Party's groups abroad had decided to defer the question of the "United States of Europe" slogan pending a discussion, in the press, on the *economic* aspect of the matter.

At our conference the debate on this question assumed a purely political character. Perhaps this was partly caused by the Central Committee's Manifesto having formulated this slogan as a forthright political one ("the immediate *political* slogan...", as it says there); not only did it advance the slogan of a republican United States of Europe, but expressly emphasised that this slogan is meaningless and false "without the revolutionary overthrow of the German, Austrian and Russian monarchies".

It would be quite wrong to object to such a presentation of the question *within the limits* of a political appraisal of this slogan—e.g., to argue that it obscures or weakens, etc., the slogan of a socialist revolution. Political changes of a truly democratic nature, and especially political revolutions, can under no circumstances whatsoever either obscure or weaken the slogan of a socialist revolution. On the contrary, they always bring it closer, extend its basis, and draw new sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the semi-proletarian masses into the socialist struggle. On the other hand, political revolutions are inevitable in the course of the socialist revolution, which should not be regarded as a single act, but as a period of turbulent political and economic upheavals, the most intense class struggle, civil war, revolutions, and counter-revolutions.

But while the slogan of a republican United States of Europe—if accompanied by the revolutionary overthrow

of the three most reactionary monarchies in Europe, headed by the Russian—is quite invulnerable as a political slogan, there still remains the highly important question of its economic content and significance. From the standpoint of the economic conditions of imperialism—i.e., the export of capital and the division of the world by the “advanced” and “civilised” colonial powers—a United States of Europe, under capitalism, is either impossible or reactionary.

Capital has become international and monopolist. The world has been carved up by a handful of Great Powers, i.e., powers successful in the great plunder and oppression of nations. The four Great Powers of Europe—Britain, France, Russia and Germany, with an aggregate population of between 250,000,000 and 300,000,000, and an area of about 7,000,000 square kilometres—possess colonies with a population of *almost 500 million* (494,500,000) and an area of 64,600,000 square kilometres, i.e., almost half the surface of the globe (133,000,000 square kilometres, exclusive of Arctic and Antarctic regions). Add to this the three Asian states—China, Turkey and Persia, now being rent piecemeal by thugs that are waging a war of “liberation”, namely, Japan, Russia, Britain and France. Those three Asian states, which may be called semi-colonies (in reality they are now 90 per cent colonies), have a total population of 360,000,000 and an area of 14,500,000 square kilometres (almost one and a half times the area of all Europe).

Furthermore, Britain, France and Germany have invested capital abroad to the value of no less than 70,000 million rubles. The business of securing “legitimate” profits from this tidy sum—these exceed 3,000 million rubles annually—is carried out by the national committees of the millionaires, known as governments, which are equipped with armies and navies and which provide the sons and brothers of the millionaires with jobs in the colonies and semi-colonies as vice-roys, consuls, ambassadors, officials of all kinds, clergymen, and other leeches.

That is how the plunder of about a thousand million of the earth’s population by a handful of Great Powers is organised in the epoch of the highest development of capitalism. No other organisation is possible under capitalism. Renounce colonies, “spheres of influence”, and the export of capital? To think that it is possible means coming down to the level of some snivelling parson who every Sunday preaches to the rich on the lofty principles of Christianity and advises

them to give the poor, well, if not millions, at least several hundred rubles yearly.

A United States of Europe under capitalism is tantamount to an agreement on the partition of colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis and no other principle of division are possible except force. A multimillionaire cannot share the "national income" of a capitalist country with anyone otherwise than "in proportion to the capital invested" (with a bonus thrown in, so that the biggest capital may receive more than its share). Capitalism is private ownership of the means of production, and anarchy in production. To advocate a "just" division of income on such a basis is sheer Proudhonism,¹⁷ stupid philistinism. No division can be effected otherwise than in "proportion to strength", and strength changes with the course of economic development. Following 1871, the rate of Germany's accession of strength was three or four times as rapid as that of Britain and France, and of Japan about ten times as rapid as Russia's. There is and there can be no other way of testing the real might of a capitalist state than by war. War does not contradict the fundamentals of private property—on the contrary, it is a direct and inevitable outcome of those fundamentals. Under capitalism the smooth economic growth of individual enterprises or individual states is impossible. Under capitalism, there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises in industry and wars in politics.

Of course, *temporary* agreements are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the *European* capitalists ... but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty *against* Japan and America, who have been badly done out of their share by the present partition of colonies, and the increase of whose might during the last fifty years has been immeasurably more rapid than that of backward and monarchist Europe, now turning senile. Compared with the United States of America, Europe as a whole denotes economic stagnation. On the present economic basis, i.e., under capitalism, a United States of Europe would signify an organisation of reaction to retard America's more rapid development. The times when the cause of democracy and socialism was associated only with Europe alone have gone for ever.

A United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is the state form of the unification and freedom of nations which we

associate with socialism—until the time when the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic. As a separate slogan, however, the slogan of a United States of the World would hardly be a correct one, first, because it merges with socialism; second, because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible, and it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others.

Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise *against* the rest of the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states. The political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic, which will more and more concentrate the forces of the proletariat of a given nation or nations, in the struggle against states that have not yet gone over to socialism. The abolition of classes is impossible without a dictatorship of the oppressed class, of the proletariat. A free union of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and stubborn struggle of the socialist republics against the backward states.

It is for these reasons and after repeated discussions at the conference of R.S.D.L.P. groups abroad, and following that conference, that the Central Organ's editors have come to the conclusion that the slogan for a United States of Europe is an erroneous one.

Sotsial-Demokrat, No. 44,
August 23, 1915

Vol. 21, pp. 339-43

From *Imperialism*,

the Highest Stage of Capitalism

Preface to the French and German Editions

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk¹⁸ dictated by monarchist Germany, and the subsequent much more brutal and despicable

Treaty of Versailles¹⁹ dictated by the "democratic" republics of America and France and also by "free" Britain, have rendered a most useful service to humanity by exposing both imperialism's hired coolies of the pen and petty-bourgeois reactionaries who, although they call themselves pacifists and socialists, sang praises to "Wilsonism",²⁰ and insisted that peace and reforms were possible under imperialism.

The tens of millions of dead and maimed left by the war—a war to decide whether the British or German group of financial plunderers is to receive the most booty—and those two "peace treaties", are with unprecedented rapidity opening the eyes of the millions and tens of millions of people who are downtrodden, oppressed, deceived and duped by the bourgeoisie. Thus, out of the universal ruin caused by the war a world-wide revolutionary crisis is arising which, however prolonged and arduous its stages may be, cannot end otherwise than in a proletarian revolution and in its victory.

The Basle Manifesto of the Second International,²¹ which in 1912 gave an appraisal of the very war that broke out in 1914 and not of war in general (there are different kinds of wars, including revolutionary wars)—this Manifesto is now a monument exposing to the full the shameful bankruptcy and treachery of the heroes of the Second International....

Written on July 6, 1920

Vol.22,p. 191

From *The Junius Pamphlet*

At last there has appeared in Germany, illegally, without any adaptation to the despicable Junker censorship, a Social-Democratic pamphlet dealing with questions of the war! The author, who evidently belongs to the "Left-radical" wing of the Party, takes the name of Junius (which in Latin means junior) and gives his pamphlet the title: *The Crisis of Social-Democracy*. Appended are the "Theses on the Tasks of International Social-Democracy", which have already been submitted to the Berne I.S.C. (International Socialist Committee) and published in No. 3 of its *Bulletin*²²; the theses were drafted by the *Internationale* group,²³ which in the spring of 1915 published one issue of a magazine under that title (with articles by Zetkin, Mehring, R. Luxemburg, Thalheimer, Duncker, Ströbel and others), and which in the winter of

1915-16 convened a conference of Social-Democrats from all parts of Germany where these theses were adopted.

The pamphlet, the author says in the introduction dated January 2, 1916, was written in April 1915, and published "without any alteration". "Outside circumstances" had prevented its earlier publication. The pamphlet is devoted not so much to the "crisis of Social-Democracy" as to an analysis of the war, to refuting the legend of it being a war for national liberation, to proving that it is an imperialist war on the part of Germany as well as on the part of the other Great Powers, and to a revolutionary criticism of the behaviour of the official party. Written in a very lively style, Junius's pamphlet has undoubtedly played and will continue to play an important role in the struggle against the ex-Social-Democratic Party of Germany, which has deserted to the bourgeoisie and the Junkers, and we extend our hearty greetings to the author.

To the Russian reader who is familiar with the Social-Democratic literature in Russian published abroad in 1914-16, the Junius pamphlet does not offer anything new in principle. In reading this pamphlet and comparing the arguments of this German revolutionary Marxist with what has been stated, for example, in the Manifesto of the Central Committee of our Party (September-November 1914), in the Berne resolutions (March 1915) and in the numerous commentaries on them, it only becomes clear that Junius's arguments are very incomplete and that he makes two mistakes. Before proceeding with a criticism of Junius's faults and errors we must strongly emphasise that this is done for the sake of self-criticism, which is so necessary to Marxists, and of submitting to an all-round test the views which must serve as the ideological basis of the Third International. On the whole, the Junius pamphlet is a splendid Marxist work, and its defects are, in all probability, to a certain extent accidental....

The first of Junius's erroneous propositions is embodied in the fifth thesis of the *Internationale* group. "National wars are no longer possible in the epoch (era) of this unbridled imperialism. National interests serve only as an instrument of deception, in order to place the working masses at the service of their mortal enemy, imperialism." The beginning of the fifth thesis, which concludes with the above statement, discusses the nature of the *present* war as an imperialist war. It may be that this negation of national war generally is either an oversight, or an accidental overstatement in emphasising the perfectly correct idea that the *present* war is an imperialist

war, not a national war. This is a mistake that must be examined, for various Social-Democrats, in view of the false assertions that the *present* war is a national war, have likewise mistakenly denied the possibility of *any* national war.

Junius is perfectly right in emphasising the decisive influence of the "imperialist atmosphere" of the *present* war, in maintaining that behind Serbia stands Russia, "behind Serbian nationalism stands Russian imperialism", and that the participation of, say, Holland in the war would likewise be imperialist, for, first, Holland would be defending her colonies and, second, would be allied with one of the *imperialist* coalitions. That is irrefutable in respect to the *present* war. And when Junius stresses what for him is most important, namely, the struggle against the "phantom of national war", "which at present holds sway over Social-Democratic policies" (p. 81), then it must be admitted that his views are both correct and fully to the point.

The only mistake, however, would be to exaggerate this truth, to depart from the Marxist requirement of concreteness, to apply the appraisal of this war to all wars possible under imperialism, to ignore the national movements *against* imperialism. The sole argument in defence of the thesis, "national wars are no longer possible", is that the world has been divided among a small group of "great" imperialist powers and for that reason any war, even if it starts as a national war, is *transformed* into an imperialist war involving the interest of one of the imperialist powers or coalitions (Junius, p. 81).

The fallacy of this argument is obvious. That all dividing lines, both in nature and society, are conventional and dynamic, and that *every* phenomenon might, under certain conditions, be transformed into its opposite, is, of course, a basic proposition of Marxist dialectics. A national war *might* be transformed into an imperialist war and *vice versa*. Here is an example: the wars of the Great French Revolution began as national wars and indeed were such. They were revolutionary wars—the defence of the great revolution against a coalition of counter-revolutionary monarchies. But when Napoleon founded the French Empire and subjugated a number of big, viable and long-established national European states, these national wars of the French became imperialist wars and *in turn* led to wars of national liberation *against* Napoleonic imperialism.

Only a sophist can disregard the difference between an imperialist and a national war on the grounds that one *might*

develop into the other. Not infrequently have dialectics served—and the history of Greek philosophy is an example—as a bridge to sophistry. But we remain dialecticians and we combat sophistry not by denying the possibility of all transformations in general, but by analysing the *given* phenomenon in its concrete setting and development.

Transformation of the present imperialist war of 1914-16 into a national war is highly improbable, for the class that represents *progressive* development is the proletariat which is objectively striving to transform it into a civil war against the bourgeoisie. Also this: there is no very considerable difference between the forces of the two coalitions, and international finance capital has created a reactionary bourgeoisie everywhere. But such a transformation should *not* be proclaimed *impossible*: if the European proletariat remains impotent, say, for twenty years; if the present war ends in victories like Napoleon's and in the subjugation of a number of viable national states; if the transition to socialism of non-European imperialism (primarily Japanese and American) is also held up for twenty years by a war between these two countries, for example, then a great national war in Europe would be possible. It would hurl Europe *back* several decades. That is improbable. But *not* impossible, for it is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong to regard the course of world history as smooth and always in a forward direction, without occasional gigantic leaps back.

Further. National wars waged by colonies and semi-colonies in the imperialist era are not only probable but *inevitable*. About 1,000 million people, or *over half* of the world's population, live in the colonies and semi-colonies (China, Turkey, Persia). The national liberation movements there are either already very strong, or are growing and maturing. Every war is the continuation of politics by other means. The continuation of national liberation politics in the colonies will *inevitably* take the form of national wars *against* imperialism. Such wars *might* lead to an imperialist war of the present "great" imperialist powers, but on the other hand they might not. It will depend on many factors.

Example: Britain and France fought the Seven Years' War²⁴ for the possession of colonies. In other words, they waged an imperialist war (which is possible on the basis of slavery and primitive capitalism as well as on the basis of modern highly developed capitalism). France suffered defeat and lost some of her colonies. Several years later there began

the national liberation war of the North American States against Britain²⁵ alone. France and Spain, then in possession of some parts of the present United States, concluded a friendship treaty with the States in rebellion against Britain. This they did out of hostility to Britain, i.e., in their own imperialist interests. French troops fought the British on the side of the American forces. What we have here is a national liberation war in which imperialist rivalry is an auxiliary element, one that has no serious importance. This is the very opposite to what we see in the war of 1914-16 (the national element in the Austro-Serbian War is of no serious importance compared with the all-determining element of imperialist rivalry). It would be absurd, therefore, to apply the concept imperialism indiscriminately and conclude that national wars are "impossible". A national liberation war, waged, for example, by an alliance of Persia, India and China against one or more of the imperialist powers, is both possible and probable, for it would follow from the national liberation movements in these countries. The transformation of such a war into an imperialist war between the present-day imperialist powers would depend upon very many concrete factors, the emergence of which it would be ridiculous to guarantee.

Third, even in Europe national wars in the imperialist epoch cannot be regarded as impossible. The "epoch of imperialism" made the present war an imperialist one and it inevitably engenders new imperialist wars (until the triumph of socialism). This "epoch" has made the policies of the present great powers thoroughly imperialist, but it by no means precludes national wars on the part of, say, small (annexed or nationally-oppressed) countries *against* the imperialist powers, just as it does not preclude large-scale national movements in Eastern Europe. Junius takes a very sober view of Austria, for example, giving due consideration not only to "economic" factors, but to the peculiar political factors. He notes "Austria's intrinsic lack of cohesion" and recognises that the "Hapsburg monarchy is not the political organisation of a bourgeois state, but only a loose syndicate of several cliques of social parasites", and that "the liquidation of Austria-Hungary is, from the historical standpoint, only the continuation of the disintegration of Turkey and, at the same time, a requirement of the historical process of development". Much the same applies to some of the Balkan countries and Russia. And if the "great" powers are altogether exhausted in the present war, or if the revolution in Russia triumphs, national wars

and even victorious national wars, are quite possible. Practical intervention by the imperialist powers is *not* always feasible. That is one point. Another is that the superficial view that the war of a small state against a giant is hopeless should be countered by the observation that even a hopeless war is a war just the same. Besides, certain factors operating within the "giant" countries — the outbreak of revolution, for example — can turn a "hopeless" war into a very "hopeful" one.

We have dwelt in detail on the erroneous proposition that "national wars are no longer possible" not only because it is patently erroneous from the theoretical point of view — it would certainly be very lamentable if the "Left" were to reveal a light-hearted attitude to Marxist theory at a time when the establishment of the Third International is possible only on the basis of unvulgarised Marxism. But the mistake is very harmful also from the standpoint of practical politics, for it gives rise to the absurd propaganda of "disarmament", since it is alleged that there can be no wars except reactionary wars. It also gives rise to the even more ludicrous and downright reactionary attitude of indifference to national movements. And such an attitude becomes chauvinism when members of the "great" European nations, that is, the nations which oppress the mass of small and colonial peoples, declare with a pseudo-scientific air: "national wars are no longer possible"! National wars *against* the imperialist powers are not only possible and probable; they are inevitable, *progressive* and *revolutionary* though of course, to be *successful*, they require either the concerted effort of huge numbers of people in the oppressed countries (hundreds of millions in our example of India and China), or a *particularly* favourable conjuncture of international conditions (e.g., the fact that the imperialist powers cannot interfere, being paralysed by exhaustion, by war, by their antagonism, etc.), or the *simultaneous* uprising of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in one of the big powers (this latter eventuality holds first place as the most desirable and favourable for the victory of the proletariat).

It would be unfair, however, to accuse Junius of indifference to national movements. At any rate, he remarks that among the sins of the Social-Democratic parliamentary group was its silence on the death sentence passed on a native leader in the Cameroons on charges of "treason" (evidently he attempted to organise an uprising against the war). Elsewhere Junius especially emphasises (for the benefit of the Legiens, Lensches and the other scoundrels who are still listed as

“Social-Democrats”) that colonial peoples must be regarded as nations along with all the others. Junius clearly and explicitly states: “Socialism recognises the right of every nation to independence and freedom, to independent mastery of its destinies”; “international socialism recognises the right of free, independent and equal nations, but it is only socialism that can create such nations, and only it can realise the right of nations to self-determination. And this socialist slogan,” Junius justly remarks, “serves, like all other socialist slogans, not to justify the existing order of things, but to indicate the way forward, and to stimulate the proletariat in its active revolutionary policy of transformation” (pp. 77-78). It would be a grave mistake indeed to believe that all the German Left Social-Democrats have succumbed to the narrow-mindedness and caricature of Marxism now espoused by certain Dutch and Polish Social-Democrats who deny the right of nations to self-determination even under socialism. But the *specific*, Dutch-Polish, roots of *this* mistake we shall discuss elsewhere.

Another fallacious argument is advanced by Junius on the question of defence of the fatherland. This is a cardinal political question during an imperialist war. Junius has strengthened us in our conviction that our Party has indicated the only correct approach to this question; the proletariat is opposed to defence of the fatherland in this imperialist war *because* of its predatory, slave-owning, reactionary character, *because* it is possible and necessary to oppose to it (and to strive to convert it into) civil war for socialism. Junius, however, while brilliantly exposing the imperialist character of the present war as distinct from a national war, makes the very strange mistake of trying to drag a national programme into the *present, non-national*, war. It sounds almost incredible, but there it is.

The official Social-Democrats, both of the Legien and of the Kautsky stripe, in their servility to the bourgeoisie (who have been making the most noise about foreign “invasion” in order to deceive the mass of the people as to the imperialist character of the war), have been particularly assiduous in repeating this “invasion” argument. Kautsky, who now assures naive and credulous people (incidentally, through Spectator, a member of the Russian Organising Committee²⁶) that he joined the opposition at the end of 1914, continues to use this “argument”! To refute it, Junius quotes extremely instructive examples from history, which prove that “invasion and class struggle are not contradictory in bourgeois history, as official

legend has it, but that one is the means and the expression of the other". For example, the Bourbons in France invoked foreign invaders against the Jacobins²⁷; the bourgeoisie in 1871 invoked foreign invaders against the Commune. In his *Civil War in France*, Marx wrote:

"The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out into civil war."*

"The classical example for all times," says Junius, referring to 1793, "is the Great French Revolution." From all this, he draws the following conclusion: "The century of experience thus proves that it is not a state of siege, but relentless class struggle, which rouses the self-respect, the heroism and the moral strength of the mass of the people, and serves as the country's best protection and defence against the external enemy."

Junius's practical conclusion is this:

"Yes, it is the duty of the Social-Democrats to defend their country during a great historical crisis. But the grave guilt that rests upon the Social-Democratic Reichstag group consists in their having given the lie to their own solemn declaration, made on August 4, 1914, 'In the hour of danger we will not leave our fatherland unprotected'. They *did* leave the fatherland unprotected in the hour of its greatest peril. For their first duty to the fatherland in that hour was to show the fatherland what was really behind the present imperialist war; to sweep away the web of patriotic and diplomatic lies covering up this encroachment on the fatherland; to proclaim loudly and clearly that both victory and defeat in the present war are equally fatal for the German people; to resist to the last the throttling of the fatherland due to the state of siege; to proclaim the necessity of immediately arming the people and of allowing the people to decide the question of war and peace; resolutely to demand a permanent session of the people's representatives for the whole duration of the war in order to guarantee vigilant control over the government by the people's representatives, and control over the people's representatives by the people; to demand the immediate abolition of all restrictions on political rights, for only a free people can successfully defend its country; and finally, to oppose the imperialist war programme, which is to preserve Austria and Turkey, i.e., perpetuate reaction in Europe and in Germany, with the old, truly national programme of the patriots and democrats of 1848, the programme of Marx, Engels and Lassalle—the slogan of a united, Great German Republic. This is the banner that should have been unfurled before the country, which would have been a truly national banner of liberation, which would have been in accord with the best traditions of Germany and with international class policy of the proletariat.... Hence, the grave dilemma—the interests of the fatherland or the international solidarity of the proletariat—the tragic conflict which

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969, Vol. 2, p. 240.

prompted our parliamentarians to side, 'with a heavy heart', with the imperialist war, is purely imaginary, it is a bourgeois nationalist fiction. On the contrary, there is complete harmony between the interests of the country and the class interests of the proletarian International, both in time of war and in time of peace; both war and peace demand the most energetic development of the class struggle, the most determined fight for the Social-Democratic programme."

This is how Junius argues. The fallacy of his argument is strikingly evident, and since the tacit and avowed lackeys of tsarism, Plekhanov and Chkhenkeli, and perhaps even Martov and Chkhheidze, may gloatingly seize upon Junius's words, not for the purpose of establishing theoretical truth, but for the purpose of wriggling, covering up their tracks and throwing dust into the eyes of the workers, we must in greater detail elucidate the *theoretical* source of Junius's error.

He suggests that the imperialist war should be "opposed" with a national programme. He urges the advanced class to turn its face to the past and not to the future! In France, in Germany, and in the whole of Europe it was a *bourgeois* democratic revolution that, *objectively*, was on the order of the day in 1793 and 1848. Corresponding to this *objective* historical situation was the "truly national", i.e., the national *bourgeois* programme of the then existing democracy; in 1793 this programme was carried out by the most revolutionary elements of the bourgeoisie and the plebeians, and in 1848 it was proclaimed by Marx in the name of the whole of progressive democracy. *Objectively*, the feudal and dynastic wars were then opposed by revolutionary-democratic wars, by wars for national liberation. This was the content of the historical tasks of that epoch.

At the present time, the *objective* situation in the biggest advanced states of Europe is different. Progress, if we leave out for the moment the possibility of temporary steps backward, can be made only in the direction of *socialist* society, only in the direction of the *socialist revolution*. From the standpoint of progress, from the standpoint of the progressive class, the imperialist bourgeois war, the war of highly developed capitalism, can, *objectively*, be opposed only with a war *against* the bourgeoisie, i.e., primarily civil war for power between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; for *unless* such a war is waged, serious progress is *impossible*; this may be followed—only under certain special conditions—by a war to defend the socialist state against bourgeois states. That is why the Bolsheviks²⁸ (fortunately, very few, and quickly handed over by us to the *Prizyv* group²⁹) who were ready to

adopt the point of view of conditional defence, i.e., defence of the fatherland on condition that there was a victorious revolution and the victory of a republic in Russia, were true to the *letter* of Bolshevism, but betrayed its *spirit*; for being drawn into the imperialist war of the leading European powers, Russia would *also* be waging an imperialist war, even under a republican form of government!

In saying that the class struggle is the best means of defence against invasion, Junius applies Marxist dialectics only half way, taking one step on the right road and immediately deviating from it. Marxist dialectics call for a concrete analysis of each specific historical situation. It is true that class struggle is the best means of defence against invasion *both* when the bourgeoisie is overthrowing feudalism, and when the proletariat is overthrowing the bourgeoisie. Precisely because it is true with regard to *every* form of class oppression, it is *too general*, and therefore, *inadequate* in the present *specific* case. Civil war against the bourgeoisie is *also* a form of class struggle, and only this form of class struggle would have saved Europe (the whole of Europe, not only one country) from the peril of invasion. The "Great German Republic", had it existed in 1914-16, would *also* have waged an *imperialist* war.

Junius came very close to the correct solution of the problem and to the correct slogan: civil war against the bourgeoisie for socialism; but, as if afraid to speak the whole truth, he turned *back*, to the fantasy of a "national war" in 1914, 1915 and 1916. If we examine the question not from the theoretical angle but from the purely practical one, Junius's error remains just as evident. The whole of bourgeois society, all classes in Germany, including the peasantry, were *in favour* of war (in all probability the *same* was the case in Russia—at least a majority of the well-to-do and middle peasantry and a very considerable portion of the poor peasants were evidently under the spell of bourgeois imperialism). The bourgeoisie was armed to the teeth. Under such circumstances to "proclaim" the programme of a republic, a permanent parliament, election of officers by the people (the "armed nation"), etc., would have meant, *in practice*, "*proclaiming*" *a revolution* (with the *wrong* revolutionary programme!).

In the same breath Junius quite rightly says that a revolution cannot be "made". Revolution was on the order of the day in the 1914-16 period, it was hidden in the depths of the war, was *emerging* out of the war. This should have been "*proclaimed*" in the name of the revolutionary class, and *its*

programme should have been fearlessly and fully announced; socialism is impossible in time of war without civil war against the arch-reactionary, criminal bourgeoisie, which condemns the people to untold disaster. Systematic, consistent, practical measures should have been planned, which *could be carried out no matter at what pace* the revolutionary crisis might develop, and which would be in line with the maturing revolution. These measures are indicated in our Party's resolution: (1) voting against war credits; (2) violation of the "class truce"; (3) creation of an illegal organisation; (4) fraternisation among the soldiers; (5) support for all the revolutionary actions of the masses. The success of *all* these steps *inevitably* leads to civil war.

The promulgation of a great historical programme was undoubtedly of tremendous significance; not the old national German programme, which became obsolete in 1914, 1915 and 1916, but the proletarian internationalist and socialist programme. "You, the bourgeoisie, are fighting for plunder; we, the workers of *all* the belligerent countries, declare war upon you for socialism"—that's the sort of speech that should have been delivered in the parliaments on August 4, 1914, by socialists who had not betrayed the proletariat, as the Legiens, Davids, Kautskys, Plekhanovs, Guesdes, Sembats, etc., had done.

Evidently Junius's error is due to two kinds of mistakes in reasoning. There is no doubt that Junius is decidedly opposed to the imperialist war and is decidedly *in favour* of revolutionary tactics; and all the gloating of the Plekhanovs over Junius's "defencism" cannot wipe out this *fact*. Possible and probable calumnies of this kind must be answered promptly and bluntly.

But, first, Junius has not completely rid himself of the "environment" of the German Social-Democrats, even the Leftists, who are afraid of a split, who are afraid to follow revolutionary slogans to their logical conclusions.* This is a false fear, and the Left Social-Democrats of Germany must and *will* rid themselves of it.

Written in July 1916

Vol. 22, pp. 305-06, 308-18

* We find the same error in Junius's arguments about which is better, victory or defeat? His conclusion is that both are equally bad (ruin, growth of armaments, etc.). This is the point of view not of the revolutionary proletariat, but of the pacifist petty bourgeoisie. If one speaks about the "revolutionary intervention" of the proletariat—of this both Junius and the theses of the *Internationale* group speak, although unfortunately in terms that are too

To Alexandra Kollontai

Not earlier than August 4, 1916

Dear A. M.,

We were very glad about the statement by the Norwegians and your efforts with the Swedes.³⁰ It would be devilishly important to have a joint international statement by the Left Marxists! (A statement of principle is the main thing, and so far the only thing possible.)

Roland-Holst, like Rakovsky (have you seen his French pamphlet?), like Trotsky, in my opinion, are *all* the most harmful "Kautskians", in the sense that all of them in various forms are for unity with the opportunists, all in various forms *embellish* opportunism, all of them (in various ways) preach eclecticism instead of revolutionary Marxism.

I think your criticism of the draft declaration does not show (unless I am mistaken) any serious differences between us. I think it mistaken in theory and harmful in practice *not* to distinguish types of wars. We cannot be against wars of national liberation. You quote the example of Serbia. But if the Serbs were *alone* against Austria, would we not be *for* the Serbs?

The essence of the thing today is the struggle *between* the Great Powers for the redivision of the colonies and the subjugation of the smaller powers.

A war of India, Persia, China and so forth with Britain or Russia? Would we not be *for* India against Britain, etc.? To call *that* "a civil war" is inexact, an obvious exaggeration. It is extremely harmful to stretch the conception of civil war beyond measure, because that *blurs* the essence of the question: a war of hired workers against the capitalists of a *particular* state.

It is the Scandinavians, apparently, who are falling into a petty-bourgeois (and provincial, *kleinstaatisch*) pacifism, repudiating "war" in general. That is not Marxist. One has to combat this, like their rejection of the militia.

general—one *must* raise the question from *another* point of view, namely:
(1) Is "revolutionary intervention" possible without the risk of defeat? (2)
Is it possible to scourge the bourgeoisie and the government of one's *own*
country without taking that risk? (3) Have we not always asserted, and does
not the historical experience of reactionary wars prove, that defeats help the
cause of the revolutionary class?

Once again greetings, and congratulations on the Norwegian declaration!

Yours
Lenin

Vol. 35, pp. 200-01

From a Letter To G. Y. Zinoviev

August 1916

We are not at all against “defence of the fatherland” *in general*, not against “defensive wars” *in general*. You will never find that nonsense in a single resolution (or in any of my articles). We are against defence of the fatherland and a defensive position in the *imperialist war* of 1914-16 and in other *imperialist* wars, typical of the *imperialist epoch*. But in the *imperialist epoch* there *may* be also “just”, “defensive”, revolutionary wars namely (1) national, (2) civil, (3) socialist *and suchlike*.

Vol. 35, p. 229

Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov)

Like every crisis in the life of individuals or in the history of nations, war oppresses and breaks some, steels and enlightens others.

The truth of that is making itself felt in Social-Democratic thinking on the war and in connection with the war. It is one thing to give serious thought to the causes and significance of an imperialist war that grows out of highly developed capitalism, Social-Democratic tactics in connection with such a war, the causes of the crisis within the Social-Democratic movement, and so on. But it is quite another to allow the war to *oppress* your thinking, to stop thinking and analysing *under the weight* of the terrible impressions and tormenting consequences or features of the war.

One such form of *oppression* or *repression* of human thinking caused by the war is the contemptuous attitude of imperialist Economism³¹ towards *democracy*. P. Kievsky does not notice that running like a red thread through all his arguments is this war-inspired oppression, this fear, this refusal to analyse.

What point is there in discussing defence of the fatherland when we are in the midst of such a terrible holocaust? What point is there in discussing nations' rights when outright strangulation is everywhere the rule? Self-determination and "independence" of nations—but look what they have done to "independent" Greece! What is the use of talking and thinking of "rights", when rights are everywhere being trampled upon in the interests of the militarists! What sense is there in talking and thinking of a republic, when there is absolutely no difference whatsoever between the most democratic republics and the most reactionary monarchies, when the war has obliterated every trace of difference!

Kievsky is very angry when told that he has given way to fear, to the extent of rejecting democracy in general. He is angry and objects: I am not against democracy, only against *one* democratic demand, which I consider "bad". But though Kievsky is offended, and though he "*assures*" us (and himself as well, perhaps) that he is not at all "against" democracy, his *arguments*—or, more correctly, the endless *errors* in his arguments—*prove* the very opposite.

Defence of the fatherland is a lie in an imperialist war, but not in a democratic and revolutionary war. All talk of "rights" seems absurd during a war, because *every* war replaces rights by direct and outright violence. But that should not lead us to forget that history has known in the past (and very likely will know, must know, in the future) wars (democratic and revolutionary wars) which, while replacing every kind of "right", every kind of democracy, by violence during the war, nevertheless, in their social content and implications, served the cause of democracy, and consequently socialism. The example of Greece, it would seem, "refutes" all national self-determination. But if you stop to think, analyse and weigh matters, and do not allow yourself to be deafened by the sound of words or frightened and oppressed by the nightmarish impressions of the war, then this example is no more serious or convincing than ridiculing the republican system because the "democratic" republics, the most democratic—not only France, but also the United States, Portugal and Switzerland—have already introduced or are introducing, in the course of this war, exactly the same kind of militarist arbitrariness that exists in Russia.

That imperialist war obliterates the difference between republic and monarchy is a fact. But to therefore reject the republic, or even be contemptuous towards it, is to allow

oneself to be frightened by the war, and one's thinking to be *oppressed* by its horrors. That is the mentality of many supporters of the "disarmament" slogan (Roland-Holst, the younger element in Switzerland, the Scandinavian "Lefts" and others). What, they imply, is the use of discussing revolutionary utilisation of the army or a militia when there is no difference in this war between a republican militia and a monarchist standing army, and when militarism is *everywhere* doing its horrible work?

That is all *one* trend of thought, *one and the same* theoretical and practical political error Kievsky unwittingly makes at every step. He *thinks* he is arguing only against self-determination, he *wants* to argue only against self-determination, but the *result*—against his will and conscience, and that is the curious thing!—is that he has adduced *not a single* argument which could not be just as well applied to democracy in general!

The real source of all his curious logical errors and confusion—and this applies not only to self-determination, but also to defence of the fatherland, divorce, "rights" in general—lies in the *oppression* of his thinking by the war, which makes him completely distort the Marxist position on democracy.

Imperialism is highly developed capitalism; imperialism is progressive; imperialism *is* the negation of democracy—"hence", democracy is "unattainable" under capitalism. Imperialist war is a flagrant violation of all democracy, whether in backward monarchies or progressive republics—"hence", there is no point in talking of "rights" (i.e., democracy!). The "only" thing that can be "opposed" to imperialist war is socialism; socialism alone is "the way out"; "hence", to advance democratic slogans in our minimum programme, i.e., under capitalism, is a deception or an illusion, befuddlement or postponement, etc., of the slogan of socialist revolution.

Though Kievsky does not realise it, that is the real source of all his mishaps. That is his *basic* logical error which, precisely because it is basic and is not realised by the author, "*explodes*" at every step like a punctured bicycle tire. It "bursts out" now on the question of defending the fatherland, now on the question of divorce, now in the phrase about "rights", in this remarkable phrase (remarkable for its utter contempt for "rights" and its utter failure to understand the issue): we shall discuss *not* rights, *but* the destruction of age-old slavery!

To say that is to show a lack of understanding of the re-

lationship between capitalism and democracy, between socialism and democracy.

Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular, turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy. Capitalism and imperialism can be overthrown only by economic revolution. They cannot be overthrown by democratic transformations, even the most "ideal". But a proletariat not schooled in the struggle for democracy is incapable of performing an economic revolution. Capitalism cannot be vanquished without *taking over the banks*, without repealing *private ownership* of the means of production. These revolutionary measures, however, cannot be implemented without organising the entire people for democratic administration of the means of production captured from the bourgeoisie, without enlisting the entire mass of the working people, the proletarians, semi-proletarians and small peasants, for the democratic organisation of their ranks, their forces, their participation in state affairs. Imperialist war may be said to be a triple negation of democracy (*a.* every war replaces "rights" by violence; *b.* imperialism as such is the negation of democracy; *c.* imperialist war fully equates the republic with the monarchy), but the awakening and growth of socialist revolt against imperialism are *indissolubly* linked with the growth of democratic resistance and unrest. Socialism leads to the withering away of *every* state, consequently also of every democracy, but socialism can be implemented only *through* the dictatorship of the proletariat, which combines violence against the bourgeoisie, i. e., the minority of the population, with *full* development of democracy, i. e., the genuinely equal and genuinely universal participation of the *entire* mass of the population in all *state* affairs and in all the complex problems of abolishing capitalism.

It is in these "contradictions" that Kievsky, having forgotten the Marxist teaching on democracy, got himself confused. Figuratively speaking, the war has so oppressed his thinking that he uses the agitational slogan "break out of imperialism" to replace all thinking, just as the cry "get out of the colonies" is used to replace analysis of what, properly speaking, is the *meaning*—economically and politically—of the civilised nations "getting out of the colonies".

The Marxist solution of the problem of democracy is for

the proletariat to *utilise all* democratic institutions and aspirations in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie in order to prepare for its overthrow and assure its own victory. Such utilisation is no easy task. To the Economists, Tolstoyans,³² etc., it often seems an unpardonable concession to "bourgeois" and opportunist views, just as to Kievsky defence of national self-determination "in the epoch of finance capital" seems an unpardonable concession to bourgeois views. Marxism teaches us that to "fight opportunism" by renouncing utilisation of the democratic institutions created and distorted by the bourgeoisie of the *given*, capitalist, society is to *completely surrender* to opportunism!

The slogan of *civil war* for socialism indicates the quickest way out of the imperialist war and *links* our struggle against the war with our struggle against opportunism. It is the only slogan that correctly takes into account both war-time peculiarities—the war is dragging out and threatening to grow into a whole "epoch" of war—and the general character of our activities as distinct from opportunism with its pacifism, legalism and adaptation to one's "own" bourgeoisie. In addition, civil war against the bourgeoisie is a *democratically* organised and *democratically* conducted war of the propertyless mass against the propertied minority. But civil war, like every other, must inevitably replace rights by violence. However, violence in the name of the interests and rights of the majority is of a different nature: it tramples on the "rights" of the exploiters, the bourgeoisie, it is *unachievable* without democratic organisation of the army and the "rear". Civil war forcibly expropriates, immediately and first of all, the banks, factories, railways, the big estates, etc. But *in order* to expropriate all this we shall have to introduce election of all officials and officers by the people, *completely merge* the army conducting the war against the bourgeoisie with the mass of the population, completely democratise administration of the food supply, the production and distribution of food, etc. The object of civil war is to seize the banks, factories, etc., destroy all possibility of resistance by the bourgeoisie, destroy *its* armed forces. But that aim cannot be achieved *either* in its purely military, *or* economic, *or* political aspects, unless we, during the war, simultaneously introduce and extend democracy among *our* armed forces and in *our* "rear". We tell the masses now (and they instinctively feel that we are right): "They are deceiving you in making you fight for imperialist capitalism in a war disguised by the great slogans

of democracy. You must, you shall wage a *genuinely* democratic war *against* the bourgeoisie for the achievement of genuine democracy and socialism." The present war unites and "merges" nations into coalitions by means of violence and financial dependence. In our civil war against the bourgeoisie, we shall unite and merge the nations *not* by the force of the ruble, *not* by the force of the truncheon, not by violence, but by voluntary agreement and solidarity of the working people against the exploiters. For the bourgeoisie the proclamation of equal rights for all nations has become a deception. For us it will be the truth that will facilitate and accelerate the winning over of all nations. Without effectively organised democratic relations between nations—and, consequently, without freedom of secession—civil war of the workers and working people generally of all nations against the bourgeoisie is *impossible*.

Through utilisation of bourgeois democracy to socialist and consistently democratic organisation of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and against opportunism. There is no other path. There is *no* other way out. Marxism, just as life itself, knows no other way out. In this path we must include free secession and free merging of nations, we must not fight shy of them, not fear that they will "defile" the "purity" of our economic aims.

Written in August-September 1916

Vol. 23, pp. 22-27

From A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism

The Marxist Attitude Towards War and "Defence of the Fatherland"

Kievsky is convinced, and wants to convince his reader, that he "disagrees" *only* with §9 of our Party Programme dealing with national self-determination. He is very angry and tries to refute the charge that on the question of democracy he is departing from the fundamentals of Marxism *in general*, that he has "betrayed" (the angry quotation marks are Kievsky's) Marxism on basic issues. But the point is that the moment our author begins to discuss his allegedly partial disagreement on an individual issue, the moment he adduces his arguments, considerations, etc., he immediately reveals

that he is deviating from Marxism all along the line. Take §b (Section 2) of his article. "This demand" (i.e., national self-determination) "directly (!!) leads to social-patriotism," our author proclaims, explaining that the "treasonous" slogan of fatherland defence follows "quite (!) logically (!) from the right of nations to self-determination...." In his opinion, self-determination implies "sanctioning the treason of the French and Belgian social-patriots, who are defending this independence" (the national independence of France and Belgium) "with arms in hand! They are *doing* what the supporters of 'self-determination' only advocate...." "Defence of the fatherland belongs to the arsenal of our worst enemies...." "We categorically refuse to understand how one can *simultaneously* be against defence of the fatherland and for self-determination, against the fatherland and for it."

That's Kievsky. He obviously has not understood our resolutions against the fatherland defence slogan in the present war. It is therefore necessary again to explain the meaning of what is so clearly set out in our resolutions.

The resolution our Party adopted at its Berne Conference in March 1915, "On the Defence of the Fatherland Slogan", begins with the words: "*The present war is, in substance...*"

That the resolution deals with the *present* war could not have been put more plainly. The words "in substance" indicate that we must distinguish between the apparent and the real, between appearance and substance, between the word and the deed. The purpose of all talk about defence of the fatherland in this war is mendaciously to present as national the imperialist war of 1914-16, waged for the division of colonies, the plunder of foreign lands, etc. And to obviate even the slightest possibility of distorting our views, we added to the resolution a special paragraph on "genuinely national wars", which "took place *especially* (especially does not mean exclusively!) between 1789 and 1871".

The resolution explains that the "basis" of these "genuinely" national wars was a "long process of mass national movements, of a struggle against absolutism and feudalism, the overthrow of national oppression...".

Clear, it would seem. The present imperialist war stems from the general conditions of the imperialist era and is not accidental, not an exception, not a deviation from the general and typical. Talk of defence of the fatherland is therefore a deception of the people, for this war is *not* a national war. In a *genuinely* national war the words "defence of the father-

land" are *not* a deception and we are *not opposed to it*. Such (genuinely national) wars took place "especially" in 1789-1871, and our resolution, while not denying by a single word that they are possible now too, explains how we should distinguish a genuinely national from an imperialist war covered by deceptive national slogans. Specifically, in order to distinguish the two we must examine whether the "basis" of the war is a "long process of mass national movements", the "overthrow of national oppression".

The resolution on "pacifism" expressly states: "Social-Democrats cannot overlook the positive significance of revolutionary wars, i. e., not imperialist wars, but such as were conducted, for instance" (note: "for instance"), "between 1789 and 1871 with the aim of doing away with national oppression...". Could our 1915 Party resolution speak of the national wars waged from 1789 to 1871 and say that we do not deny the positive significance of such wars if they were not considered possible today too? Certainly not.

A commentary, or popular explanation, of our Party resolutions is given in the Lenin and Zinoviev pamphlet *Socialism and War*. It plainly states, on page 5, that "socialists have regarded wars 'for the defence of the fatherland', or 'defensive' wars, as legitimate, progressive and just" *only* in the sense of "overthrowing alien oppression". It cites an example: Persia against Russia, "etc.", and says: "These would be just, and defensive wars, irrespective of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory 'Great' Powers."*

The pamphlet appeared in August 1915 and there are German and French translations. Kievsky is fully aware of its contents. And never, on no occasion, has he or anyone else challenged the resolution on the defence of the fatherland slogan, or the resolution on pacifism, or their interpretation in the pamphlet. Never, not once! We are therefore entitled to ask: are we slandering Kievsky when we say that he has absolutely failed to understand Marxism if, beginning with March 1915, he has not challenged our Party's views on the war, whereas now, in August 1916, in an article on self-determination, i. e., on a supposedly partial issue, he reveals an amazing lack of understanding of a *general* issue?

Kievsky says that the fatherland defence slogan is "treas-

* See present edition, p. 29.—Ed.

sonous". We can confidently assure him that *every* slogan is and always will be "treasonous" *for those* who mechanically repeat it without understanding its meaning, without giving it proper thought, *for those* who merely memorise the words without analysing their implications.

What, generally speaking, is "defence of the fatherland"? Is it a scientific concept relating to economics, politics, etc.? No. It is a much bandied about current expression, sometimes simply a philistine phrase, intended to *justify the war*. Nothing more. Absolutely nothing! The term "treasonous" can apply only in the sense that the philistine is capable of justifying *any* war by pleading "we are defending our fatherland", whereas Marxism, which does not degrade itself by stooping to the philistine's level, requires an historical analysis of each war in order to determine whether or not *that particular* war can be considered progressive, whether it serves the interests of democracy and the proletariat and, in *that sense*, is legitimate, just, etc.

The defence of the fatherland slogan is all too often unconscious philistine justification of war and reveals inability to analyse the meaning and implications of a particular war and see it in historical perspective.

Marxism makes that analysis and says: *if* the "substance" of a war is, *for example*, the overthrow of alien oppression (which was *especially* typical of Europe in 1789-1871), then such a war is progressive as far as the oppressed state or nation is concerned. *If*, however, the "substance" of a war is redivision of colonies, division of booty, plunder of foreign lands (and such is the war of 1914-16), then all talk of defending the fatherland is "sheer deception of the people".

How, then, can we disclose and define the "substance" of a war? War is the continuation of policy. Consequently, we must examine the policy pursued prior to the war, the policy that led to and brought about the war. If it was an imperialist policy, i. e., one designed to safeguard the interests of finance capital and rob and oppress colonies and foreign countries, then the war stemming from that policy is imperialist. If it was a national liberation policy, i. e., one expressive of the mass movement against national oppression, then the war stemming from that policy is a war of national liberation.

The philistine does not realise that war is "the continuation of policy", and consequently limits himself to the formula that "the enemy has attacked us", "the enemy has invaded my country", without stopping to think *what issues* are

at stake in the war, *which* classes are waging it, and with *what* political objects. Kievsky stoops right down to the level of such a philistine when he declares that Belgium has been occupied by the Germans, and hence, from the point of view of self-determination, the "Belgian social-patriots are right", or: the Germans have occupied part of France, hence, "Guesde can be satisfied", for "what is involved is territory populated by his nation" (and not by an alien nation).

For the philistine the important thing is *where* the armies stand, who is winning *at the moment*. For the Marxist the important thing is *what issues* are at stake in *this* war, during which first one, then the other army may be on top.

What is the present war being fought over? The answer is given in our resolution (based on the policy the belligerent powers pursued for decades prior to the war). England, France and Russia are fighting to keep the colonies they have seized, to be able to rob Turkey, etc. Germany is fighting to take over these colonies and to be able herself to rob Turkey, etc. Let us suppose even that the Germans take Paris or St. Petersburg. Would that change the nature of the present war? Not at all. The Germans' purpose—and more important, the policy that would bring it to realisation if they were to win—is to seize the colonies, establish domination over Turkey, annex areas populated by other nations, for instance, Poland, etc. It is definitely not to bring the French or the Russians under foreign domination. The real nature of the present war is not national but imperialist. In other words, it is not being fought to enable one side to overthrow national oppression, which the other side is trying to maintain. It is a war between two groups of oppressors, between two free-booters over the division of their booty, over who shall rob Turkey and the colonies.

In short: a war *between* imperialist Great Powers (i.e., powers that oppress a whole number of nations and enmesh them in dependence on finance capital, etc.), or *in alliance* with the Great Powers, is an imperialist war. Such is the war of 1914-16. And in *this* war "defence of the fatherland" is a deception, an attempt to justify the war.

A war *against* imperialist, i.e., oppressing, powers by oppressed (for example, colonial) nations is a genuine national war. It is possible today too. "Defence of the fatherland" in a war waged by an oppressed nation against a foreign oppressor is not a deception. Socialists are *not* opposed to "defence of the fatherland" in *such* a war.

National self-determination is the same as the struggle for complete national liberation, for complete independence, against annexation, and socialists *cannot*—without ceasing to be socialists—reject *such* a struggle in whatever form, right down to an uprising or war.

Kievsky thinks he is arguing against Plekhanov: it was Plekhanov who pointed to the link between self-determination and defence of the fatherland! Kievsky *believed* Plekhanov that the link *was really* of the kind Plekhanov made it out to be. And having believed him, Kievsky took fright and decided that he must reject self-determination so as not to fall into Plekhanov's conclusions.... There is great trust in Plekhanov, and great fright, but there is no trace of *thought* about the substance of Plekhanov's mistake!

The social-chauvinists plead self-determination in order to present this war as a national war. There is only one correct way of combating them: we must show that the war is being fought not to liberate nations, but to determine which of the great robbers will oppress *more* nations. To fall into negation of wars *really* waged for liberating nations is to present the worst possible caricature of Marxism. Plekhanov and the French social-chauvinists harp on the republic in France in order to justify its "defence" against the German monarchy. If we were to follow Kievsky's line of reasoning, we would have to oppose either the republic or a war *really* fought to preserve the republic!! The German social-chauvinists point to universal suffrage and compulsory primary education in their country to justify its "defence" against tsarism. If we were to follow Kievsky's line of reasoning, we would have to oppose either universal suffrage and compulsory primary education or a war *really* fought to safeguard political freedom against attempts to abolish it!

Up to the 1914-16 war Karl Kautsky was a Marxist, and many of his major writings and statements will always remain models of Marxism. On August 26, 1910, he wrote in *Die Neue Zeit*, in reference to the imminent war:

"In a war between Germany and England the issue is not democracy, but world domination, i.e., exploitation of the world. That is not an issue on which Social-Democrats can side with the exploiters of their nation" (*Neue Zeit*, 29. Jahrg., Bd. 2, S. 776).

There you have an excellent Marxist formulation, one that fully coincides with our own and fully exposes the *present-day*

Kautsky, who has turned from Marxism to defence of social-chauvinism. It is a formulation (we shall have occasion to revert to it in other articles) that clearly brings out the principles underlying the Marxist attitude towards war. War is the continuation of policy. Hence, once there is a struggle for democracy, a war for democracy is *possible*. National self-determination is but one of the democratic demands and does not, in principle, differ from other democratic demands. "World domination" is, to put it briefly, the substance of imperialist policy, of which imperialist war is the continuation. Rejection of "defence of the fatherland" in a democratic war, *i.e.*, rejecting participation in such a war, is an absurdity that has nothing in common with Marxism. To embellish imperialist war by applying to it the concept of "defence of the fatherland", *i.e.*, by presenting it as a democratic war, is to deceive the workers and side with the reactionary bourgeoisie....

Written in August-October 1916

Vol. 23, pp. 29-35

From The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution

Among the Dutch, Scandinavian and Swiss revolutionary Social-Democrats who are combating the social-chauvinist lies about "defence of the fatherland" in the present imperialist war, there have been voices in favour of replacing the old Social-Democratic minimum-programme demand for a "militia", or "the armed nation", by a new demand: "disarmament". The *Jugend-Internationale*³³ has inaugurated a discussion on this issue and published, in No. 3, an editorial supporting disarmament. There is also, we regret to note, a concession to the "disarmament" idea in R. Grimm's latest theses.³⁴ Discussions have been started in the periodicals *Neues Leben* and *Vorbote*.³⁵

Let us take a closer look at the position of the disarmament advocates.

I

Their principal argument is that the disarmament demand is the clearest, most decisive, most consistent expression of the struggle against all militarism and against all war.

But in this principal argument lies the disarmament advocates' principal error. Socialists cannot, without ceasing to be socialists, be opposed to all war.

Firstly, socialists have never been, nor can they ever be, opposed to revolutionary wars. The bourgeoisie of the imperialist "Great" Powers has become thoroughly reactionary, and the war *this* bourgeoisie is now waging we regard as a reactionary, slave-owners' and criminal war. But what about a war *against* this bourgeoisie? A war, for instance, waged by peoples oppressed by and dependent upon this bourgeoisie, or by colonial peoples, for liberation? In § 5 of the *Internationale* group theses we read: "National wars are no longer possible in the era of this unbridled imperialism." That is obviously wrong.

The history of the twentieth century, this century of "unbridled imperialism", is replete with colonial wars. But what we Europeans, the imperialist oppressors of the majority of the world's peoples, with our habitual, despicable European chauvinism, call "colonial wars" are often national wars, or national rebellions of these oppressed peoples. One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates capitalist development in the most backward countries, and thereby extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. That is a fact, and from it inevitably follows that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. Junius, who defends the above-quoted "theses" in her pamphlet, says that in the imperialist era every national war against an imperialist Great Power leads to the intervention of a rival imperialist Great Power. Every national war is thus turned into an imperialist war. But that argument is wrong too. This *can* happen, but does not always happen. Many colonial wars between 1900 and 1914 did not follow that course. And it would be simply ridiculous to declare, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the utter exhaustion of all the belligerents, "there can be no" national, progressive, revolutionary wars "of any kind", waged, say, by China in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and tantamount to European chauvinism in practice: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., are invited to tell the oppressed peoples that it is "impossible" for them to wage war against "our" nations!

Secondly, civil war is just as much a war as any other. He who accepts the class struggle cannot fail to accept civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions inevitable, continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. That has been confirmed by every great revolution. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, is to fall into extreme opportunism and renounce the socialist revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This is bound to create not only friction, but a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he clearly stated that it was possible for *already victorious* socialism to wage "defensive wars". What he had in mind was defence of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not merely of one country, will wars become impossible. And from a scientific point of view it would be utterly wrong—and utterly unrevolutionary—for us to evade or gloss over the most important thing: crushing the resistance of the bourgeoisie—the most difficult task, and one demanding the greatest amount of fighting, in the *transition* to socialism. The "social" parsons and opportunists are always ready to build dreams of future peaceful socialism. But the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats is that they refuse to think about and reflect on the fierce class struggle and class wars needed to achieve that beautiful future.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term "defence of the fatherland", for instance, is hateful to many because both avowed opportunists and Kautskyites

use it to cover up and gloss over the bourgeois lie about the *present* predatory war. This is a fact. But it does not follow that we must no longer see through to the meaning of political slogans. To accept "defence of the fatherland" in the present war is no more nor less than to accept it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat—no more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be sheer folly to repudiate "defence of the fatherland" *on the part* of oppressed nations in their wars *against* the imperialist Great Powers, or on the part of a victorious proletariat in *its* war against some Gallifet of a bourgeois state.

Theoretically, it would be absolutely wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of policy by other means. The present imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist policies of two groups of Great Powers, and these policies were engendered and fostered by the sum total of the relationships of the imperialist era. But this very era must also necessarily engender and foster policies of struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and, consequently, also the possibility and inevitability, first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second, of proletarian wars and rebellions *against* the bourgeoisie; and, third, of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war, etc.

Written in German
in September 1916

Vol. 23, pp. 77-80

From *The "Disarmament" Slogan*

I

One of the principal premises advanced, although not always definitely expressed, in favour of disarmament is this: we are opposed to war, to all war in general, and the demand for disarmament is the most definite, clear and unambiguous expression of this point of view.

We showed the fallacy of that idea in our review of Junius's pamphlet, to which we refer the reader.* Socialists cannot be opposed to all war in general without ceasing to be socialists. We must not allow ourselves to be blinded by the present imperialist war. Such wars between "Great" Powers are

* See present edition, pp. 40-50.—*Ed.*

typical of the imperialist epoch; but democratic wars and rebellions, for instance, of oppressed nations against their oppressors to free themselves from oppression, are by no means impossible. Civil wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for socialism are inevitable. Wars are possible between one country in which socialism has been victorious and other, bourgeois or reactionary, countries.

Disarmament is the ideal of socialism. There will be no wars in socialist society; consequently, disarmament will be achieved. But whoever expects that socialism will be achieved *without* a social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a socialist. Dictatorship is state power based directly on *violence*. And in the twentieth century—as in the age of civilisation generally—violence means neither a fist nor a club, but *troops*. To put “disarmament” in the programme is tantamount to making the general declaration: We are opposed to the use of arms. There is as little Marxism in this as there would be if we were to say: We are opposed to violence!

It should be observed that the international discussion of this question was conducted mainly, if not exclusively, in the German language. The Germans, however, use two words, the difference between which is not easily rendered in Russian. One, strictly speaking, means “disarmament”,* and is used by Kautsky and the Kautskyites, for instance, in the sense of reduction of armaments. The other, strictly speaking, means “disarming”,** and is used mainly by the Lefts in the sense of abolishing militarism, abolishing all militarist systems. In this article we speak of the *latter* demand, which is current among certain *revolutionary* Social-Democrats.

The Kautskyite advocacy of “disarmament”, which is addressed to the present governments of the imperialist Great Powers, is the most vulgar opportunism, it is bourgeois pacifism, which *actually*—in spite of the “good intentions” of the sentimental Kautskyites—serves to distract the workers from the revolutionary struggle. For this advocacy seeks to instil in the workers the idea that the present bourgeois governments of the imperialist powers are *not* bound to each other by thousands of threads of finance capital and by scores or hundreds of corresponding *secret treaties* (i.e., predatory, plundering treaties, preparing the way for imperialist war).

* *Abrüstung*.—Ed.

** *Entwaffnung*.—Ed.

II

An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through the class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class.

In every class society, whether based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, on wage-labour, the oppressor class is always armed. Not only the modern standing army, but even the modern militia—and even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for instance—represent the bourgeoisie armed *against* the proletariat. That is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it. Suffice it to recall that in all capitalist countries without exception troops (including the republican-democratic militia) are used against strikers. A bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest, fundamental and cardinal facts of modern capitalist society.

And in face of this fact, revolutionary Social-Democrats are urged to "demand" "disarmament"! That is tantamount to complete abandonment of the class-struggle point of view, to renunciation of all thought of revolution. Our slogan must be: arming of the proletariat to defeat, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie. These are the only tactics possible for a revolutionary class, tactics that follow logically from, and are dictated by, the whole *objective development* of capitalist militarism. Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historic mission, to consign all armaments to the scrap-heap. And the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.

If the present war arouses among the reactionary Christian socialists, among the whimpering petty bourgeoisie, *only* horror and fright, *only* aversion to all use of arms, to bloodshed, death, etc., then we must say: Capitalist society is and has always been *horror without end*. And if this most reactionary of all wars is now preparing for that society *an end in horror*, we have no reason to fall into despair. But the disarmament "demand", or more correctly, the dream of disarmament, is, objectively, nothing but an expression of despair at a time when, as everyone can see, the bourgeoisie

itself is paving the way for the only legitimate and revolutionary war—civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie.

A lifeless theory, some might say, but we would remind them of two world-historical facts: the role of the trusts and the employment of women in industry, on the one hand, and the Paris Commune of 1871 and the December 1905 uprising in Russia, on the other.

The bourgeoisie makes it its business to promote trusts, drive women and children into the factories, subject them to corruption and suffering, condemn them to extreme poverty. We do not “demand” such development, we do not “support” it. We fight it. But *how* do we fight? We explain that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want a return to the handicraft system, pre-monopoly capitalism, domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to socialism!

That argument takes account of *objective* development and, with the necessary changes, applies also to the present militarisation of the population. Today the imperialist bourgeoisie militarises the youth as well as the adults; tomorrow it may begin militarising the women. Our attitude should be: All the better! Full speed ahead! For the faster we move, the nearer shall we be to the armed uprising against capitalism. How can Social-Democrats give way to fear of the militarisation of the youth, etc., if they have not forgotten the example of the Paris Commune? This is not a “lifeless theory” or a dream. It is a fact. And it would be a sorry state of affairs indeed if, all the economic and political facts notwithstanding, Social-Democrats began to doubt that the imperialist era and imperialist wars must inevitably bring about a repetition of such facts.

A certain bourgeois observer of the Paris Commune, writing to an English newspaper in May 1871, said: “If the French nation consisted entirely of women, what a terrible nation it would be!” Women and teen-age children fought in the Paris Commune side by side with the men. It will be no different in the coming battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian women will not look on passively as poorly armed or unarmed workers are shot down by the well-armed forces of the bourgeoisie. They will take to arms, as they did in 1871, and from the cowed nations of today—or more correctly, from the present-day labour movement, disorganised more by the opportunists than by the governments—there will undoubtedly arise, sooner or later, but

with absolute certainty, an international league of the “terrible nations” of the revolutionary proletariat.

The whole of social life is now being militarised. Imperialism is a fierce struggle of the Great Powers for the division and redivision of the world. It is therefore bound to lead to further militarisation in all countries, even in neutral and small ones. How will proletarian women oppose this? Only by cursing all war and everything military, only by demanding disarmament? The women of an oppressed and really revolutionary class will never accept that shameful role. They will say to their sons:

“You will soon be grown up. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art properly. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as is being done in the present war, and as the traitors to socialism are telling you to do. They need it to fight the bourgeoisie of their own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, and not by pious wishes, but by defeating and disarming the *bourgeoisie*. ”

If we are to shun such propaganda, precisely such propaganda, in connection with the present war, then we had better stop using fine words about international revolutionary Social-Democracy, the socialist revolution and war against war....

Written in October 1916

Vol. 23, pp. 94-99

From a Letter To Inessa Armand

November 30, 1916

Dear Friend,

As regards “defence of the fatherland” I don’t know whether we differ or not. You find a contradiction between my article in the collection of articles *To the Memory of Marx** and my present statements, *without quoting* either precisely. I cannot reply to this. I haven’t got the collection *To the Memory of Marx*. Of course, I cannot remember word for word what I wrote in it. Without *precise* quotations, then and now, I am not able to reply to *such* an argument on your part.

But *generally speaking*, it seems to me that you argue

* See “Marxism and Revisionism”, V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, pp. 29 - 39. — Ed.

somehow in a somewhat one-sided and formalist manner. You have taken *one* quotation from the *Communist Manifesto* (the working men have no country) and you seem to want to apply it without any reservations, *up to and including the repudiation of national wars*.

The whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system, demands that each proposition should be considered (α) only historically, (β) only in connection with others, (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history.

The fatherland is an historical concept. The fatherland in an epoch or, more precisely, at the *moment* of struggle for the overthrow of national oppression, is one thing. At the moment when national movements have been left far behind, it is another thing. For the "three types of countries" (§6 of our theses on self-determination*) there *cannot be* a proposition about the fatherland, and its defence, identically applicable in all conditions.

In the *Communist Manifesto* it is said that the working men have no country.

Correct. But *not only* this is stated there. It is stated there also that when national states are being formed the role of the proletariat is somewhat special. To take the first proposition (the working men have no country) and *forget* its *connection* with the second (the workers are constituted as a class nationally, though not in the same sense as the bourgeoisie) will be exceptionally incorrect.

Where then does the connection lie? In my opinion, precisely in the fact that in the *democratic* movement (at such a moment, in such concrete circumstances) the proletariat cannot refuse to support it (and, consequently, support defence of the fatherland in a national war).

Marx and Engels said in the *Communist Manifesto* that the working men have no country. But the same Marx *called* for a *national* war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859 (the end of his pamphlet *Po and Rhine*, where the *national* feeling of the Germans is directly inflamed, where they are directly called upon to wage a *national war*). Engels in 1891, in view of the then threatening and advancing war of France (Boulanger) + Alexander III against Germany, *directly* recognised "defence of the fatherland".**

* See "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 150-52). — Ed.

** See K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 255; M/E, Werke, Bd. 22, S. 252-56. — Ed.

Were Marx and Engels muddlers who said one thing today and another thing tomorrow? No. In my view, admission of "defence of the fatherland" in a national war *fully* answers the requirements of Marxism. In 1891 the German *Social-Democrats* really *should have* defended their fatherland in a war against Boulanger + Alexander III. This would have been a peculiar variety of *national* war....

Vol.35, pp. 250-51

From *An Open Letter to Boris Souvarine*

But from a Marxist viewpoint, such general and abstract definitions as "unpatriotic" are of absolutely no value. The fatherland, the nation are historical categories. I am not at all opposed to wars waged in defence of democracy or against national oppression, nor do I fear such words as "defence of the fatherland" in reference to these wars or to insurrections. Socialists always side with the oppressed and, consequently, cannot be opposed to wars whose purpose is democratic or socialist struggle against oppression. It would therefore be absurd to deny the legitimacy of the wars of 1793, of France's wars against the reactionary European monarchies, or of the Garibaldi wars, etc.... And it would be just as absurd not to recognise the legitimacy of wars of oppressed nations against their oppressors, wars that might break out today — rebellion of the Irish against England, for instance, rebellion of Morocco against France, or the Ukraine against Russia, etc....

The Marxist viewpoint requires that in each individual case we define the political content of the war.

But what determines the political content of a war?

Every war is only the continuation of policy. What kind of policy is being continued in the present war? The policy of the proletariat, which from 1871 to 1914 was the sole exponent of socialism and democracy in France, England and Germany? Or imperialist policy, the policy of colonial rapine and oppression of weak nations by the reactionary, decadent and moribund bourgeoisie?

The question has only to be squarely put and we get a perfectly clear answer: the present war is an imperialist war. It is a war of slave-owners quarrelling over their chattels and eager to consolidate and perpetuate slavery. It is the "capitalist brigandage" of which Jules Guesde spoke in 1899, thereby

condemning in advance his own betrayal. Guesde said at the time:

"There are other wars ... they arise every day, wars for the acquisition of markets. This kind of war does not disappear, but, on the contrary, bids fair to become continuous. It is chiefly a war between the capitalists of all countries for profits and possession of the world market, and it is fought at the price of our blood. Now, just imagine that in each of the capitalist countries of Europe, this mutual slaughter for the sake of plunder is directed by a socialist! Just imagine an English Millerand, an Italian Millerand, a German Millerand, in addition to a French Millerand, working to embroil the proletarians in this capitalist brigandage and make them fight each other! What would remain, I ask you comrades, of international solidarity? On the day the Millerands became a common phenomenon, we would have to say 'farewell' to all internationalism and become nationalists, and this neither you nor I will ever agree to" (Jules Guesde, *En Garde!*, Paris, 1911, pp. 175-76).

It is not true that France is waging this 1914-17 war for freedom, national independence, democracy, and so on.... She is fighting to retain her colonies, and for England to retain hers, colonies to which Germany would have had a much greater right — from the standpoint of bourgeois law, of course. She is fighting to give Russia Constantinople, etc.... Consequently, this war is being waged not by democratic and revolutionary France, not by the France of 1792, nor the France of 1848, nor the France of the Commune. It is being waged by bourgeois France, reactionary France, that ally and friend of tsarism, the "world usurer" (the expression is not mine, it belongs to Lysis, a contributor to *l'Humanité*³⁶), who is defending his booty, his "sacred right" to possess colonies, his "freedom" to exploit the entire world with the help of the millions loaned to weaker or poorer nations.

Do not tell me it is hard to distinguish between revolutionary and reactionary wars. You want me to indicate a purely practical criterion that would be understood by all, in addition to the scientific criterion indicated above?

Here it is: Every fair-sized war is prepared beforehand. When a revolutionary war is being prepared, democrats and socialists *are not afraid to state in advance* that they favour "defence of the fatherland" in this war. When however, in contrast, a reactionary war is being prepared, no socialist will *venture to state in advance*, that is, before war is declared, that he will favour "defence of the fatherland".

Marx and Engels were not afraid to urge the German people to fight Russia in 1848 and 1859.

In contrast, at their Basle Congress in 1912 the socialists did

not venture to speak of “defence of the fatherland” in the war they could see was maturing and which broke out in 1914.

Our Party is not afraid to declare publicly that it will sympathise with wars or uprisings which Ireland might start against England; Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia against France; Tripoli against Italy; the Ukraine, Persia, China against Russia, etc.

But what of the social-chauvinists? And the “Centrists”? Will they have the courage openly and officially to state that they favour, or will favour, “defence of the fatherland” in the event of war breaking out between, say, Japan and the United States, a clearly imperialist war prepared over the course of many years, and one which would imperil many hundreds of millions of people? I dare them! I am prepared to wager that they will not, for they know only too well that if they make such a statement, they will become a laughing-stock in the eyes of the workers, they will be jeered at and driven out of the socialist parties. That is why the social-chauvinists and those in the “Centre” will avoid any open statement and will continue to wriggle, lie and confuse the issue, seeking refuge in all manner of sophisms, like this one in the resolution of the last, 1915 French party congress: “An attacked country has the right to defence.”

As if the question were: *Who was the first to attack*, and not: *What are the causes of the war? What are its aims? Which classes are waging it?* Could one imagine, for example, a sane-minded socialist recognising England’s right to “defence of the fatherland” in 1796, when the French revolutionary troops began to fraternise with the Irish? And yet it was the French who had attacked England and were actually preparing to land in Ireland. And could we, tomorrow, recognise the right to “defence of the fatherland” for Russia and England, if, after they had been taught a lesson by Germany, they were attacked by Persia in alliance with India, China and other revolutionary nations of Asia performing their 1789 and 1793?

That is my reply to the really ludicrous charge that we share Tolstoy’s views. Our Party has rejected both the Tolstoy doctrine and pacifism, declaring that socialists must seek to transform the present war into a civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, for socialism.

Should you object that this is utopian, I will answer that the bourgeoisie of France, England, etc., do not, apparently, subscribe to that opinion. They would not play so vile and ridiculous a role, going to the length of jailing or conscripting

"pacifists", had they not felt and foreseen the inevitable and steady rise of revolution and its early approach....

Written in the second half
of December (old style) 1916

Vol. 23, pp. 196-99

From a Letter *To Inessa Armand*

January 19, 1917

...As regards "defence of the fatherland", in my opinion, you are falling into abstraction and unhistoricalness. I repeat what I said in the article against Yuri: defence of the fatherland = justification for taking part in the *war*. Nothing more. To generalise this, to make it a "general principle", is *ridiculous*, supremely unscientific. (I will send you the American programme of the S.L.P.,* with this ridiculous generalisation.) Wars are a supremely varied, diverse, complex thing. One cannot approach them with a general pattern.

(I) Three main types: the relation of an oppressed nation to the oppressor (every war is the continuation of politics; politics is the *relationship* between nations, classes, etc). As a general rule, war is legitimate on the part of the oppressed (irrespective of whether it is defensive or offensive in the military sense).

(II) The relation between two oppressor nations. The struggle for colonies, for markets, etc. (Rome and Carthage; Britain and Germany 1914-17). As a general rule, a war of that kind is robbery on *both* sides; and the attitude of democracy (and socialism) to it comes under the rule: "Two thieves are fighting, may they both perish"....

(III) The third type. A *system* of nations with equal rights. This question is *much more complex!!!!* Especially if side by side with civilised, comparatively democratic nations there stands tsarism. That's how it was (approximately) in Europe from 1815 to 1905.

1891. The colonial policy of France and Germany was *insignificant*. Italy, Japan, the United States *had no colonies at all* (now they have). In Western Europe a *system* had come into being (N. B. this!! Think over this!! Don't forget this!! We live not only in separate states, but also in a certain *system* of states; it is permissible for the anarchists to ignore this;

* Socialist Labour Party.—*Ed.*

we are not anarchists), a *system* of states, on the whole constitutional and national. *Side by side* with them was powerful, unshaken, pre-revolutionary tsarism, which had plundered and oppressed everyone for hundreds of years, which crushed the revolutions of 1849 and 1863.

Germany (in 1891) was the country of *advanced* socialism. And this country was menaced by tsarism in alliance with Boulangism!

The situation was quite, quite different from what it is in 1914-17, when tsarism has been undermined by 1905, while Germany is waging a war to dominate the world. A *different* pair of shoes!!

To identify, even to compare the international situations of 1891 and 1914, is the *height* of unhistoricalness.

Stupid Radek wrote recently in the Polish manifesto ("*Befreiung Polens*") that "*Staatenbau*" is not the aim of the Social-Democratic struggle. This is arch-stupidity! It is half-anarchism, half-idiocy! No, no, we are not at all indifferent to the *Staatenbau*, to the *system* of states, to their *mutual relations*.

Engels was the father of "passive radicalism"?? Untrue! Nothing of the kind. You will never be able to prove this. (Bogdanov and Co. tried, but only disgraced themselves.)

In the *imperialist* war of 1914-17, between *two* imperialist coalitions, we must be against "defence of the fatherland" since (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism, (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves over their booty, (3) in *both* coalitions there is an *advanced* proletariat, (4) in both a socialist revolution is *ripe*. Only for these reasons are we against "defence of the fatherland", only for these reasons!!

Best greetings and wishes.

Yours,
Lenin

Vol. 35, pp. 273-74

From *The Revolution in Russia and the Tasks of the Workers of All Countries*

Comrade workers,

The prediction of the socialists who have remained faithful to socialism and have not succumbed to the savage and beastly

war hysteria has proved correct. The first revolution, caused by the world-wide predatory war among the capitalists of various countries, has broken out.³⁷ The imperialist war, that is, a war for the capitalist division of spoils, for the strangling of weak nations, has *begun* to turn into civil war, that is, a war of the workers against the capitalists, of the toilers and the oppressed against their oppressors, against tsars and kings, landowners and capitalists, a war for mankind's complete liberation from wars, from poverty of the masses, from oppression of man by man!

To the Russian workers has fallen the honour and the good fortune of being the *first* to start the revolution—the great and only legitimate and just war, the war of the oppressed against the oppressors....

Written on March 12 (25), 1917

Vol. 23, p. 350

From *The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution*

1) In our attitude towards the war, which under the new government of Lvov and Co. unquestionably remains on Russia's part a predatory imperialist war owing to the capitalist nature of that government, not the slightest concession to "revolutionary defencism" is permissible.

The class-conscious proletariat can give its consent to a revolutionary war, which would really justify revolutionary defencism, only on condition: (a) that the power pass to the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants aligned with the proletariat; (b) that all annexations be renounced in deed and not in word; (c) that a complete break be effected in actual fact with all capitalist interests.

In view of the undoubted honesty of those broad sections of the mass believers in revolutionary defencism who accept the war only as a necessity, and not as a means of conquest, in view of the fact that they are being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary with particular thoroughness, persistence and patience to explain their error to them, to explain the inseparable connection existing between capital and the imperialist war, and to prove that without overthrowing capital *it is impossible* to end the war by a truly democratic peace, a peace not imposed by violence.

The most widespread campaign for this view must be organised in the army at the front.

Fraternisation.

Written on April 4 and 5
(17 and 18), 1917

Vol. 24, pp. 21-22

From *The Tasks of the Proletariat
in Our Revolution*

Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party

Revolutionary Defencism
and Its Class Significance

9. *Revolutionary defencism* must be regarded as the most important, the most striking manifestation of the petty-bourgeois wave that has swept over "nearly everything". It is the worst enemy of the further progress and success of the Russian revolution.

Those who have yielded on this point and have been unable to extricate themselves are lost to the revolution. But the masses yield in a different way from the leaders, and they extricate themselves *differently*, by a different course of development, by different means.

Revolutionary defencism is, on the one hand, a result of the deception of the masses by the bourgeoisie, a result of the trustful lack of reasoning on the part of the peasants and a section of the workers; it is, on the other, an expression of the interests and point of view of the small proprietor, who is to some extent interested in annexations and bank profits, and who "sacredly" guards the traditions of tsarism, which demoralised the Great Russians by making them do a hangman's work against the other peoples.

The bourgeoisie deceives the people by working on their noble pride in the revolution and by pretending that the *social and political* character of the war, as far as Russia is concerned, underwent a change because of this stage of the revolution, because of the substitution of the near-republic of Guchkov and Milyukov for the tsarist monarchy. And the people believed it—for a time—largely owing to age-old prejudices, which made them look upon the other peoples of Russia, i.e., the non-Great Russians, as something in the nature of a property and private estate of the Great Russians.

This vile demoralisation of the Great-Russian people by tsarism which taught them to regard the other peoples as something inferior, something belonging "by right" to Great Russia, could not disappear *instantly*.

What is required of us is the *ability* to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined not by the "good will" of individuals or groups, or even of nations, but by the position of the *class* which conducts the war, by the class *policy* of which the war is a continuation, by the *ties* of capital, which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the *imperialist character* of international capital, by Russia's dependence in finance, banking and diplomacy upon Britain, France, and so on. To explain this skilfully in a way the people would understand *is not easy*; none of us would be able to do it at once without committing errors.

But this, and only this, must be the aim or, rather, the message of our propaganda. The slightest concession to revolutionary defencism is a *betrayal of socialism*, a complete renunciation of *internationalism*, no matter by what fine phrases and "practical" considerations it may be justified.

The slogan "Down with the War!" is, of course, correct. But it fails to take into account the specific nature of the tasks of the present moment and the necessity of *approaching* the broad mass of the people *in a different way*. It reminds me of the slogan "Down with the Tsar!" with which the inexperienced agitator of the "good old days" went simply and directly to the countryside—and got a beating for his pains. The mass believers in revolutionary defencism are *honest*, not in the personal, but in the class sense, i.e., they belong to *classes* (workers and the peasant poor) which in *actual fact* have nothing to gain from annexations and the subjugation of other peoples. This is nothing like the bourgeois and the "intellectual" fraternity, who know very well that you *cannot* renounce annexations without renouncing the rule of capital, and who unscrupulously deceive the people with fine phrases, with unlimited promises and endless assurances.

The rank-and-file believer in defencism regards the matter in the simple way of the man in the street: "I don't want annexations, but the Germans are 'going for' me, therefore I'm defending a just cause and not any kind of imperialist interests at all." To a man like this it must be explained again and again that it is not a question of his personal wishes, but

of mass, *class*, political relations and conditions, of the connection between the war and the interests of capital and the international network of banks, and so forth. Only such a struggle against defencism will be serious and will promise success—perhaps not a very rapid success, but one that will be real and enduring.

How Can the War Be Ended?

10. The war cannot be ended “at will”. It cannot be ended by the decision of one of the belligerents. It cannot be ended by “sticking your bayonet into the ground”, as one soldier, a defencist, expressed it.

The war cannot be ended by an “agreement” among the socialists of the various countries, by the “action” of the proletarians of all countries, by the “will” of the peoples, and so forth. All the phrases of this kind, which fill the articles of the defencist, semi-defencist, and semi-internationalist papers as well as innumerable resolutions, appeals, manifestos, and the resolutions of the Soviet of Soldiers’ and Workers’ Deputies—all such phrases are nothing but idle, innocent and pious wishes of the petty bourgeois. There is nothing more harmful than phrases like “ascertaining the will of the peoples for peace”, like the *sequence* of revolutionary actions of the proletariat (after the Russian proletariat comes the turn of the German), etc. All this is Blancism,³⁸ fond dreams, a playing at “political campaigning”, and in reality just a repetition of the fable of Vaska the Cat.

The war is not a product of the evil will of rapacious capitalists, although it is undoubtedly being fought *only* in their interests and they alone are being enriched by it. The war is a product of half a century of development of world capitalism and of its billions of threads and connections. It is *impossible* to slip out of the imperialist war and achieve a democratic, non-coercive peace without overthrowing the power of capital and transferring state power to *another* class, the proletariat.

The Russian revolution of February-March 1917 was the beginning of the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. This revolution took the *first* step towards ending the war; but it requires a *second* step, namely, the transfer of state power to the proletariat, to make the end of the war a *certainty*. This will be the beginning of a “break-through” on a world-wide scale, a break-through in the front of capitalist

interests; and only by breaking through *this* front can the proletariat save mankind from the horrors of war and endow it with the blessings of peace.

It is directly to such a "break-through" in the front of capitalism that the Russian revolution has *already* brought the Russian proletariat by creating the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

Written on April 10 (23), 1917

Vol.24, pp. 64-67

*From Speech in Favour
of the Resolution on the War
April 27 (May 10), 1917*

**7th (April) All-Russia Conference
of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)**

Comrades, the original draft resolution on the war was read by me at the City Conference. Because of the crisis that absorbed the attention and energy of all our comrades in Petrograd, we were unable to amend the draft. Since yesterday, however, the committee working on it has made satisfactory progress: the draft has been changed, considerably shortened and, in our opinion, improved.

I wish to say a few words about the construction of this resolution. It consists of three parts. The first is devoted to a class analysis of the war; it also contains our statement of principles explaining why our Party warns against placing any trust in promises made by the Provisional Government,³⁹ as well as against any support for that government. The second part of the resolution deals with the question of revolutionary defencism as an extremely broad mass movement which has now united against us the overwhelming majority of the nation. Our task is to define the class significance of this revolutionary defencism, its essence, and the real balance of forces, and find a way to fight this trend. The third part of the resolution deals with the question of how to end the war. This practical question, which is of supreme importance to our Party, required a detailed answer. We think that we have succeeded in meeting this requirement satisfactorily. The articles in *Pravda*⁴⁰ and numerous articles on the war published in provincial newspapers (the latter reach us very irregularly, because the postal service is disorganised, and

we have to take every convenient opportunity of getting them for the Central Committee) reveal a negative attitude towards the war and the loan. I think that the vote against the loan settled the question as to our opposition to revolutionary defencism. I do not think it is possible to go into greater detail on this.

"The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for the division of the profits obtained from world domination, for markets for finance (banking) capital, for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities, etc."

The primary and basic issue is the meaning of the war, a question of a general and political character, a moot question which the capitalists and the social-chauvinists carefully evade. This is why we must put this question first, with this addition to it:

"Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries. In Russia, moreover, prolongation of the war involves a grave danger to the revolution's gains and its further development.

"The passing of state power in Russia to the Provisional Government, a government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned."

The words I have just read to you are of great importance in all our propaganda and agitation. Has the class character of the war changed now? Can it change? Our reply is based on the fact that power has passed to the landowners and capitalists, the same government that had engineered this war. We then pass on to one of the facts that reveal most clearly the character of the war. Class character as expressed by the entire policy carried on for decades by definite classes is one thing, the obvious class character of the war is another.

"This fact was most strikingly demonstrated when the new government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally and without consulting the nation confirmed these secret treaties, which promise the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc. By concealing these treaties from the people of Russia the latter are being deceived as to the true character of the war."

And so, I emphasise again, we are pointing out one particularly striking confirmation of the character of the war. Even if there were no treaties at all, the character of the war would be the same because groups of capitalists can very often come to an agreement without any treaties. But the treaties exist and their implications are apparent. For the purpose of co-ordinating the work of our agitators and propagandists, we think this fact should be especially emphasised, and so we have made a special point of it. The people's attention is and should be called to this fact, all the more so as the treaties were concluded by the tsar, who has been overthrown. The people ought to be made aware that the present governments are carrying on the war on the basis of treaties concluded between the old governments. This, I feel, makes the contradictions between the capitalist interests and the will of the people stand out most strikingly, and it is for the propagandists to expose these contradictions, to draw the people's attention to them, to strive to explain them to the masses by appealing to their class-consciousness. The contents of these treaties leave no room for doubt that they promise enormous profits to the capitalists to be derived from robbing other countries. That is why they are always kept secret. There is not a republic in the world whose foreign policy is conducted in the open. It is fatuous, while the capitalist system exists, to expect the capitalists to open up their ledgers. While there is private ownership of the means of production, there is bound to be private ownership of shares and financial operations. The corner-stone of contemporary diplomacy is financial operations, which amount to robbing and strangling the weak nationalities. These, we believe, are the fundamental premises upon which the evaluation of the war rests. Proceeding from these premises we conclude that: "For this reason, no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of capital, can support the present war, or the present government, or its loans."

This is our chief and basic conclusion. It determines our whole tactics and sets us apart from all the other parties, no matter how socialistic they claim to be. This proposition, which is irrefutable to all of us, predetermines our attitude towards all the other political parties....

From *War and Revolution*
A Lecture Delivered May 14 (27), 1917

The question of war and revolution has been dealt with so often lately in the press and at every public meeting that probably many of you are not only familiar with many aspects of the question but have come to find them tedious. I have not yet had a single opportunity to address or even attend any Party or for that matter any public meetings in this district, and therefore I run the risk, perhaps, of repetition or of not dealing in sufficient detail with those aspects of the question that interest you most.

It seems to me that the most important thing that is usually overlooked in the question of the war, a key issue to which insufficient attention is paid and over which there is so much dispute—useless, hopeless, idle dispute, I should say—is the question of the class character of the war: what caused that war, what classes are waging it, and what historical and historico-economic conditions gave rise to it. As far as I have been able to follow the way the question of the war is dealt with at public and Party meetings, I have come to the conclusion that the reason why there is so much misunderstanding on the subject is because, all too often, when dealing with the question of the war, we speak in entirely different languages.

From the point of view of Marxism, that is, of modern scientific socialism, the main issue in any discussion by socialists on how to assess the war and what attitude to adopt towards it is this: what is the war being waged for, and what classes staged and directed it. We Marxists do not belong to that category of people who are unqualified opponents of all war. We say: our aim is to achieve a socialist system of society, which, by eliminating the division of mankind into classes, by eliminating all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, will inevitably eliminate the very possibility of war. But in the war to win that socialist system of society we are bound to encounter conditions under which the class struggle within each given nation may come up against a war between the different nations, a war conditioned by this very class struggle. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility of revolutionary wars, i.e., wars arising from the class struggle, wars waged by revolutionary classes, wars which are of direct and immediate revolutionary significance. Still less can we rule this out when we remember that though the history of European

revolutions during the last century, in the course of 125-135 years, say, gave us wars which were mostly reactionary, it also gave us revolutionary wars, such as the war of the French revolutionary masses against a united monarchist, backward, feudal and semi-feudal Europe. No deception of the masses is more widespread today in Western Europe, and latterly here in Russia, too, than that which is practised by citing the example of revolutionary wars. There are wars and wars. We must be clear as to what historical conditions have given rise to the war, what classes are waging it, and for what ends. Unless we grasp this, all our talk about the war will necessarily be utterly futile, engendering more heat than light. That is why I take the liberty, seeing that you have chosen war and revolution as the subject of today's talk, to deal with this aspect of the matter at greater length.

We all know the dictum of Clausewitz, one of the most famous writers on the philosophy and history of war, which says: "War is a continuation of policy by other means." This dictum comes from a writer who reviewed the history of wars and drew philosophic lessons from it shortly after the period of the Napoleonic wars. This writer, whose basic views are now undoubtedly familiar to every thinking person, nearly eighty years ago challenged the ignorant man-in-the-street conception of war as being a thing apart from the policies of the governments and classes concerned, as being a simple attack that disturbs the peace, and is then followed by restoration of the peace thus disturbed, as much as to say: "They had a fight, then they made up!" This is a grossly ignorant view, one that was repudiated scores of years ago and is repudiated by any more or less careful analysis of any historical epoch of wars.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. All wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them. The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. When the French revolutionary townspeople and revolutionary peasants overthrew the monarchy at the close of the eighteenth century by revolutionary means and established a democratic republic—when they made short work of their monarch, and short work of their landowners, too, in a revolutionary fashion—that policy of the revolutionary class was bound to

shake all the rest of autocratic, tsarist, imperial, and semi-feudal Europe to its foundations. And the inevitable continuation of this policy of the victorious revolutionary class in France was the wars in which all the monarchist nations of Europe, forming their famous coalition, lined up against revolutionary France in a counter-revolutionary war. Just as within the country the revolutionary people of France had then, for the first time, displayed revolutionary energy on a scale it had never shown for centuries, so in the war at the close of the eighteenth century it revealed a similar gigantic revolutionary creativeness when it remodelled its whole system of strategy, broke with all the old rules and traditions of warfare, replaced the old troops with a new revolutionary people's army, and created new methods of warfare. This example, to my mind, is noteworthy in that it clearly demonstrates to us things which the bourgeois journalists are now always forgetting when they pander to the philistine prejudices and ignorance of the backward masses who do not understand this intimate economic and historical connection between every kind of war and the preceding policy of every country, every class that ruled before the war and achieved its ends by so-called "peaceful" means. So-called, because the brute force required to ensure "peaceful" rule in the colonies, for example, can hardly be called peaceful.

Peace reigned in Europe, but this was because domination over hundreds of millions of people in the colonies by the European nations was sustained only through constant, incessant, interminable wars, which we Europeans do not regard as wars at all, since all too often they resembled, not wars, but brutal massacres, the wholesale slaughter of unarmed peoples. The thing is that if we want to know what the present war is about we must first of all make a general survey of the policies of the European powers as a whole. We must not take this or that example, this or that particular case, which can easily be wrenched out of the context of social phenomena and which is worthless, because an opposite example can just as easily be cited. We must take the whole policy of the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations if we are to understand how the present war steadily and inevitably grew out of this system.

We are constantly witnessing attempts, especially on the part of the capitalist press—whether monarchist or republican—to read into the present war an historical meaning which it does not possess. For example, no device is more frequently

resorted to in the French Republic than that of presenting this war on France's part as a continuation and counterpart of the wars of the Great French Revolution of 1792. No device for hoodwinking the French masses, the French workers and the workers of all countries is more widespread than that of applying to our epoch the "jargon" of that other epoch and some of its watchwords, or the attempt to present matters as though now, too, republican France is defending her liberty against the monarchy. One "minor" fact overlooked is that then, in 1792, war was waged in France by a revolutionary class, which had carried out an unparalleled revolution and displayed unmatched heroism in utterly destroying the French monarchy and rising against a united monarchist Europe with the sole and single aim of carrying on its revolutionary struggle.

The war in France was a continuation of the policy of the revolutionary class which had carried out the revolution, won the republic, settled accounts with the French capitalists and landowners with unprecedented vigour, and was waging a revolutionary war against a united monarchist Europe in continuation of that policy.

What we have at present is primarily two leagues, two groups of capitalist powers. We have before us all the world's greatest capitalist powers—Britain, France, America, and Germany—who for decades have doggedly pursued a policy of incessant economic rivalry aimed at achieving world supremacy, subjugating the small nations, and making threefold and tenfold profits on banking capital, which has caught the whole world in the net of its influence. That is what Britain's and Germany's policies really amount to. I stress this fact. This fact can never be emphasised strongly enough, because if we forget this we shall never understand what this war is about, and we shall then be easy game for any bourgeois publicist who tries to foist lying phrases on us.

The real policies of the two groups of capitalist giants—Britain and Germany, who, with their respective allies, have taken the field against each other—policies which they were pursuing for decades before the war, should be studied and grasped in their entirety. If we did not do this we should not only be neglecting an essential requirement of scientific socialism and of all social science in general, but we should be unable to understand anything whatever about the present war. We should be putting ourselves in the power of Milyukov, that deceiver, who is stirring up chauvinism and hatred of

one nation for another by methods which are applied everywhere without exception, methods which Clausewitz wrote about eighty years ago when he ridiculed the very view some people are holding today, namely, that the nations lived in peace and then they started fighting. As if this were true! How can a war be accounted for without considering its bearing on the preceding policy of the given state, of the given system of states, the given classes? I repeat: this is a basic point which is constantly overlooked. Failure to understand it makes nine-tenths of all war discussions mere wrangling, so much verbiage. We say: if you have not studied the policies of both belligerent groups over a period of decades—so as to avoid accidental factors and the quoting of random examples—if you have not shown what bearing this war has on preceding policies, then you don't understand what this war is all about.

These policies show us just one thing—continuous economic rivalry between the world's two greatest giants, capitalist economies. On the one hand we have Britain, a country which owns the greater part of the globe, a country which ranks first in wealth, which has created this wealth not so much by the labour of its workers as by the exploitation of innumerable colonies, by the vast power of its banks which have developed at the head of all the others into an insignificantly small group of some four or five super-banks handling billions of rubles, and handling them in such a way that it can be said without exaggeration that there is not a patch of land in the world today on which this capital has not laid its heavy hand, not a patch of land which British capital has not enmeshed by a thousand threads. This capital grew to such dimensions by the turn of the century that its activities extended far beyond the borders of individual states and formed a group of giant banks possessed of fabulous wealth. Having begotten this tiny group of banks, it has caught the whole world in the net of its billions. This is the sum and substance of Britain's economic policy and of the economic policy of France, of which even French writers, some of them contributors to *L'Humanité*, a paper now controlled by ex-socialists (in fact, no less a man than Lysis, the well-known financial writer), stated several years before the war: "France is a financial monarchy, France is a financial oligarchy, France is the world's money-lender."

On the other hand, opposed to this, mainly Anglo-French group, we have another group of capitalists, an even more rapacious, even more predatory one, a group who came to

the capitalist banqueting table when all the seats were occupied, but who introduced into the struggle new methods for developing capitalist production, improved techniques, and superior organisation, which turned the old capitalism, the capitalism of the free-competition age, into the capitalism of giant trusts, syndicates, and cartels. This group introduced the beginnings of state-controlled capitalist production, combining the colossal power of capitalism with the colossal power of the state into a single mechanism and bringing tens of millions of people within the single organisation of state capitalism. Here is economic history, here is diplomatic history, covering several decades, from which no one can get away. It is the one and only guide-post to a proper solution of the problem of war; it leads you to the conclusion that the present war, too, is the outcome of the policies of the classes who have come to grips in it, of the two supreme giants, who, long before the war, had caught the whole world, all countries, in the net of financial exploitation and economically divided the globe up among themselves. They were bound to clash, because a redivision of this supremacy, from the point of view of capitalism, had become inevitable.

The old division was based on the fact that Britain, in the course of several centuries, had ruined her former competitors. A former competitor was Holland, which had dominated the whole world. Another was France, which had fought for supremacy for nearly a hundred years. After a series of protracted wars Britain was able, by virtue of her economic power, her merchant capital, to establish her unchallenged sway over the world. In 1871 a new predator appeared, a new capitalist power arose, which developed at an incomparably faster pace than Britain. That is a basic fact. You will not find a book on economic history that does not acknowledge this indisputable fact—the fact of Germany's faster development. This rapid development of capitalism in Germany was the development of a young strong predator, who appeared in the concert of European powers and said: "You ruined Holland, you defeated France, you have helped yourself to half the world—now be good enough to let us have our fair share." What does "a fair share" mean? How is it to be determined in the capitalist world, in the world of banks? There power is determined by the number of banks, there power is determined in the way described by a mouthpiece of the American multi-millionaires, which declared with typically American frankness and typically American cynicism: "The war in Europe is

being waged for world domination. To dominate the world two things are needed: dollars and banks. We have the dollars, we shall make the banks and we shall dominate the world." This statement was made by a leading newspaper of the American multimillionaires. I must say, there is a thousand times more truth in this cynical statement of a blustering American multimillionaire than in thousands of articles by bourgeois liars who try to make out that this war is being waged for national interests, on national issues, and utter similar glaringly patent lies which dismiss history completely and take an isolated example like the case of the German beast of prey who attacked Belgium. The case is undoubtedly a real one. This group of predators did attack Belgium with brutal ferocity, but it did the same thing the other group did yesterday by other means and is doing today to other nations.

When we argue about annexations—and this bears on the question I have been trying briefly to explain to you as the history of the economic and diplomatic relations which led up to the present war—when we argue about annexations we always forget that these, generally, are what the war is being waged for; it is for the carve-up of conquered territories, or, to put it more popularly, for the division of the plundered spoils by the two robber gangs. When we argue about annexations we constantly meet with methods, which, scientifically speaking, do not stand up to criticism, and which, as methods of public journalism, are deliberate humbug. Ask a Russian chauvinist or social-chauvinist what annexation by Germany means, and he will give you an excellent explanation, because he understands that perfectly well. But he will never answer a request for a general definition of annexation that will fit them all—Germany, Britain, and Russia. He will never do that! And when *Rech*⁴¹ (to pass from theory to practice) sneered at *Pravda*, saying, "These Pravdists consider Kurland a case of annexation! How can you talk to such people!" and we answered: "Please give us such a definition of annexation as would apply to the Germans, the English, and the Russians, and we add that either you evade this issue or we shall expose you on the spot"—*Rech* kept silent. We maintain that no newspaper, either of the chauvinists in general, who simply say that the fatherland must be defended, or of the social-chauvinists, has ever given a definition of annexation that would fit both Germany and Russia, that would be applicable to any side. It cannot do this for the simple reason

that this war is the continuation of a policy of annexations, that is, a policy of conquest, of capitalist robbery on the part of both groups involved in the war. Obviously, the question of which of these two robbers was the first to draw the knife is of small account to us. Take the history of the naval and military expenditures of these two groups over a period of decades, take the history of the little wars they waged before the big war—"little" because few Europeans died in those wars, whereas hundreds of thousands of people belonging to the nations they were subjugating died in them, nations which from their point of view could not be regarded as nations at all (you couldn't very well call those Asians and Africans nations!); the wars waged against these nations were wars against unarmed people, who were simply shot down, machine-gunned. Can you call them wars? Strictly speaking, they were not wars at all, and you could forget about them. That is their attitude to this downright deception of the masses.

The present war is a continuation of the policy of conquest, of the shooting down of whole nationalities, of unbelievable atrocities committed by the Germans and the British in Africa, and by the British and the Russians in Persia—which of them committed most it is difficult to say. It was for this reason that the German capitalists looked upon them as their enemies. Ah, they said, you are strong because you are rich? But we are stronger, therefore we have the same "sacred" right to plunder. That is what the real history of British and German finance capital in the course of several decades preceding the war amounts to. That is what the history of Russo-German, Russo-British, and German-British relations amounts to. There you have the clue to an understanding of what the war is about. That is why the story that is current about the cause of the war is sheer duplicity and humbug. Forgetting the history of finance capital, the history of how this war had been brewing over the issue of redivision, they present the matter like this: two nations were living at peace, then one attacked the other, and the other fought back. All science, all banks are forgotten, and the peoples are told to take up arms, and so are the peasants, who know nothing about politics. All they have to do is to fight back! The logical thing, following this line of argument, would be to close down all newspapers, burn all books and ban all mention of annexations in the press. In this way such a view of annexations could be justified. They can't tell the truth about annexations because the whole history of Russia, Britain, and Germany has been

one of continuous, ruthless and sanguinary war over annexations. Ruthless wars were waged in Persia and Africa by the Liberals, who flogged political offenders in India for daring to put forward demands which were being fought for here in Russia. The French colonial troops oppressed peoples too. There you have the pre-history, the real history of unprecedented plunder! Such is the policy of these classes, of which the present war is a continuation. That is why, on the question of annexations, they cannot give the reply that we give, when we say that any nation joined to another one, not by the voluntary choice of its majority but by a decision of a king or government, is an annexed nation. To renounce annexation is to give each nation the right to form a separate state or to live in union with whomsoever it chooses. An answer like that is perfectly clear to every worker who is at all class-conscious.

In every resolution, of which dozens are passed, and published even in such a paper as *Zemlya i Volya*,⁴² you will find the answer, poorly expressed: We don't want a war for supremacy over other nations, we are fighting for our freedom. That is what all the workers and peasants say, that is how they express the view of the workingman, his understanding of the war. They imply by this that if the war were in the interests of the working people against the exploiters they would be for such a war. So would we, and there is not a revolutionary party that could be against it. Where they go wrong, these movers of numerous resolutions, is when they believe that the war is being waged by them. We soldiers, we workers, we peasants are fighting for our freedom. I shall never forget the question one of them asked me after a meeting. "Why do you speak against the capitalists all the time?" he said. "I'm not a capitalist, am I? We're workers, we're defending our freedom." You're wrong, you are fighting because you are obeying your capitalist government; it's the governments, not the peoples, who are carrying on this war. I am not surprised at a worker or peasant, who doesn't know his politics, who has not had the good or bad fortune of being initiated into the secrets of diplomacy or the picture of this finance plunder (this oppression of Persia by Russia and Britain, say)—I am not surprised at him forgetting this history and saying naively: Who cares about the capitalists, when it's me who's fighting! He doesn't understand the connection between the war and the government, he doesn't understand that the war is being waged by the government, and that he is just a tool in the hands of that government. He can call

himself a revolutionary people and write eloquent resolutions — to Russians this means a lot, because this has come into their lives only recently. There has recently appeared a “revolutionary” declaration by the Provisional Government. This doesn’t mean anything. Other nations, more experienced than we are in the capitalist art of hoodwinking the masses by penning “revolutionary” manifestos, have long since broken all the world’s records in this respect. If you take the parliamentary history of the French Republic since it became a republic supporting tsarism, you will find dozens of examples during the decades of this history when manifestos full of the most eloquent phrases served to mask a policy of the most outrageous colonial and financial plunder. The whole history of the Third Republic in France⁴³ is a history of this plunder. Such are the origins of the present war. It is not due to malice on the part of capitalists or the mistaken policy of some monarch. To think so would be incorrect. No, this war is an inevitable outgrowth of super-capitalism, especially banking capital, which resulted in some four banks in Berlin and five or six in London dominating the whole world, appropriating the world’s funds, reinforcing their financial policy by armed force, and finally clashing in a savage armed conflict because they had come to the end of their free tether in the matter of conquests. One or the other side had to relinquish its colonies. Such questions are not settled voluntarily in this world of capitalists. This issue could only be settled by war. That is why it is absurd to blame one or another crowned brigand. They are all the same, these crowned brigands. That is why it is equally absurd to blame the capitalists of one or another country. All they are to blame for is for having introduced such a system. But this has been done in full keeping with the law, which is safeguarded by all the forces of a civilised state. “I am fully within my rights, I am a buyer of shares. All the law courts, all the police, the whole standing army and all the navies in the world are safeguarding my sacred right to these shares.” Who’s to blame for banks being set up which handle hundreds of millions of rubles, for these banks casting their nets of plunder over the whole world, and for their being locked in mortal combat? Find the culprit if you can! The blame lies with half a century of capitalist development, and the only way out of this is by the overthrow of the rule of the capitalists and by a workers’ revolution. That is the answer our Party has arrived at from an analysis of the war, and that is why we say: the very simple question of annexations

has been so muddled up and the spokesmen of the bourgeois parties have uttered so many lies that they are able to make out that Kurland is not annexation by Russia. They have shared Kurland and Poland between them, those three crowned brigands. They have been doing this for a hundred years, carving up the living flesh. And the Russian brigand snatched most because he was then the strongest. And now that the young beast of prey, Germany, who was then a party to the carve-up, has grown into a strong capitalist power, she demands a redivision. You want things to stay as they were? she says. You think you are stronger? Let's try conclusions!

That is what the war boils down to. Of course, the challenge "let's try conclusions" is merely an expression of the decade-long policy of plunder, the policy of the big banks. That is why no one but we can tell this truth about annexations, a simple truth that every worker and peasant will understand. That is why the question of treaties, such a simple question, is deliberately and disgracefully confused by the whole press. You say that we have a revolutionary government, that there are ministers in that government who are well-nigh socialists—Narodniks⁴⁴ and Mensheviks.⁴⁵ But when they make declarations about peace without annexations, on condition that this term is not defined (because it means taking away German annexations and keeping our own), then we say: Of what value are your "revolutionary" cabinet, your declarations, your statements that you are not out for a war of conquest, if at the same time you tell the army to take the offensive? Don't you know that we have treaties, that these treaties were concluded by Nicholas the Bloody in the most predatory fashion? You don't know it? It is pardonable for the workers or peasants not to know that. They did not plunder, they read no clever books. But when educated Cadets⁴⁶ preach this sort of stuff they know perfectly well what these treaties are about. Although they are "secret" treaties, the whole diplomatic press in all countries talks about them, saying: "You'll get the Straits, you'll get Armenia, you'll get Galicia, you'll get Alsace-Lorraine, you'll get Trieste, and we'll make a final carve-up of Persia." And the German capitalist says: "I'll seize Egypt, I'll subjugate the European nations unless you return my colonies to me with interest." Shares are things that can't do without interest. That is why the question of treaties, itself a clear, simple question, has touched off such a torrent of barefaced outrageous lies as those that are now pouring from the pages of all the capitalist newspapers.

Take today's paper *Dyen*.⁴⁷ Vodovozov, a man absolutely innocent of Bolshevism, but who is an honest democrat, states in it: I am opposed to secret treaties; let me say this about the treaty with Rumania. There is a secret treaty with Rumania and it says that Rumania will receive a number of foreign peoples if she fights on the side of the Allies. The treaties which the other Allies have are all the same. They wouldn't have started to subjugate nations if they had not had these treaties. To know their contents you do not have to burrow in special journals. It is sufficient to recollect the basic facts of economic and diplomatic history. For decades Austria has been after the Balkans with an eye to subjugation. And if they have clashed it is because they couldn't help clashing. That is why, when the masses demand that these treaties should be published, a demand that is growing more insistent every day, ex-Minister Milyukov and the present Minister Tereshchenko (one in a government without socialist ministers, the other in a government with a number of near-socialist ministers⁴⁸) declare that publication of the treaties would mean a break with the Allies.

Obviously, you can't publish the treaties because you are all participants in the same gang of robbers. We agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published. Two different conclusions can be drawn from this. If we agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published — what follows from this? If the treaties cannot be published, then we've got to help the capitalist ministers continue the war. The other conclusion is this: since the capitalists cannot publish the treaties themselves, then the capitalists have got to be overthrown. Which of these two conclusions you consider to be correct, I leave it to you to decide, but be sure to consider the consequences. If we reason the way the Narodnik and Menshevik ministers reason, we come to this: once the government says that the treaties cannot be published, then we must issue a new manifesto. Paper is not so dear yet that we cannot write new manifestos. We shall write a new manifesto and start an offensive. What for? With what aims? Who is to set these aims? The soldiers are called upon to carry out the predatory treaties with Rumania and France. Send Vodovozov's article to the front and then complain that this is all the Bolsheviks' doing, the Bolsheviks must have invented this treaty-with-Rumania business. In that case you would not only have to make life a hell for *Pravda*, but even kick Vodovozov out for having

studied history. You would have to make a bonfire of all Milyukov's books—terribly dangerous books those. Just open any book by the leader of the party of "people's freedom", by this ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs. They are good books. What do they say? They say that Russia has "a right" to the Straits, to Armenia, to Galicia, to Eastern Prussia. He has carved them all up, and even appends a map. Not only the Bolsheviks and Vodovozov will have to be sent to Siberia for writing such revolutionary articles, but Milyukov's books will have to be burnt too, because if you collected simple quotations from these books today and sent them to the front, no inflammatory leaflet would have such an inflammatory effect as this would have.

It remains for me now, according to the brief plan of this talk I have sketched for myself, to touch on the question of "revolutionary defencism". I believe, after what I have had the honour of reporting to you, that I may now be allowed to touch only briefly on this question.

By "revolutionary defencism" we mean vindication of the war on the plea that, after all, we have made the revolution, after all, we are a revolutionary people, a revolutionary democracy. But what answer do we give to that? What revolution did we make? We overthrew Nicholas. The revolution was not so very difficult compared with one that would have overthrown the whole class of landowners and capitalists. Who did the revolution put in power? The landowners and capitalists—the very same classes who have long been in power in Europe. Revolutions like this occurred there a hundred years ago. The Tereshchenkos, Milyukovs, and Konovalovs have been in power there for a long time, and it doesn't matter a bit whether they have a civil list⁴⁹ to pay their tsars or whether they do without this luxury. A bank remains a bank, whether capital is invested in concessions by the hundred or not; profits remain profits, be it in a republic or in a monarchy. If any savage country dares to disobey our civilised Capital, which sets up such splendid banks in the colonies, in Africa and Persia—if any savage nation should disobey our civilised bank, we send troops out who restore culture, order, and civilisation, as Lyakhov did in Persia, and the French "republican" troops did in Africa, where they exterminated peoples with equal ferocity. What difference does it make? We have here the same "revolutionary defencism", displayed only by the unenlightened masses, who see no connection between war and the government, who do not know

that this policy is sanctioned by treaties. The treaties have remained, the banks have remained, the concessions have remained. In Russia the best men of their class are in the government, but the nature of the war has not changed a bit because of this. The new "revolutionary defencism" uses the great concept of revolution merely as a cloak to cover up the dirty and bloody war waged for the sake of dirty and outrageous treaties.

The Russian revolution has not altered the war, but it has created organisations which exist in no other country and were seldom found in revolutions in the West. Most of the revolutions were confined to the emergence of governments of our Tereshchenko and Konovalov type, while the country remained passive and disorganised. The Russian revolution has gone further than that. In this we have the germ of hope that it may overcome the war. Besides the government of "near-socialist" ministers, the government of imperialist war, the government of offensive, a government tied up with Anglo-French capital—besides this government and independent of it we have all over Russia a network of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies. Here is a revolution which has not said its last word yet. Here is a revolution which Western Europe, under similar conditions, has not known. Here are organisations of those classes which really have no need for annexations, which have not put millions in the banks, and which are probably not interested in whether the Russian Colonel Lyakhov and the British Liberal ambassador divided Persia properly or not. Here is the pledge of this revolution being carried further, i.e., that the classes which have no interest in annexations, and despite the fact that they put too much trust in the capitalist government, despite the appalling muddle and appalling deception contained in the very concept "revolutionary defencism", despite the fact that they support the war loan, support the government of imperialist war—despite all this—have succeeded in creating organisations in which the mass of the oppressed classes are represented. These are the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, which, in very many local areas in Russia, have gone much further than the Petrograd Soviet in their revolutionary work. It is only natural, because in Petrograd we have the central authority of the capitalists....

This brings me to the last question—that of how to end the war. The ridiculous view is ascribed to us that we are out

for a separate peace. The German robber capitalists are making peace overtures, saying: "We'll give you a piece of Turkey and Armenia if you give us ore-bearing lands." That is what the diplomats are talking about in every neutral city! Everybody knows it. Only it is veiled with conventional diplomatic phrases. That's what diplomats are for—to speak in diplomatic language. What nonsense it is to allege that we are for ending the war by a separate peace! To end the war which is being waged by the capitalists of all the wealthiest powers, a war stemming from the decade-long history of economic development, by one-sided withdrawal from military operations is such a stupid idea that it would be absurd even to refute it. The fact that we specially drew up a resolution to refute it is because we wanted to explain things to the broad masses before whom we were being slandered. It is not a matter that can be seriously discussed. The war which the capitalists of all countries are waging cannot be ended without a workers' revolution against these capitalists. So long as control remains a mere phrase instead of deed, so long as the government of the capitalists has not been replaced by a government of the revolutionary proletariat, the government is doomed merely to reiterate: We are heading for disaster, disaster, disaster. Socialists are now being jailed in "free" Britain for saying what I am saying. In Germany Liebknecht has been imprisoned for saying what I am saying, and in Austria Friedrich Adler is in jail for saying the same thing with the help of a revolver (he may have been executed by now).⁵⁰ The sympathy of the mass of workers in all countries is with these socialists and not with those who have sided with their capitalists. The workers' revolution is mounting throughout the world. In other countries it is a more difficult matter, of course. They have no half-wits there like Nicholas and Rasputin. There the best men of their class are at the head of the government. They lack conditions there for a revolution against autocracy. They have there a government of the capitalist class. The most talented representatives of that class have been governing there for a long time. That is why the revolution there, though it has not come yet, is bound to come, no matter how many revolutionaries, men like Friedrich Adler and Karl Liebknecht, may die in the attempt. The future belongs to them, and the workers of all countries follow their lead. The workers in all countries are bound to win.

On the question of America entering the war I shall say this. People argue that America is a democracy, America

has the White House. I say: Slavery was abolished there half a century ago. The anti-slave war ended in 1865. Since then multimillionaires have mushroomed. They have the whole of America in their financial grip. They are making ready to subdue Mexico and will inevitably come to war with Japan over a carve-up of the Pacific. This war has been brewing for several decades. All literature speaks about it. America's real aim in entering the war is to prepare for this future war with Japan. The American people do enjoy considerable freedom and it is difficult to conceive them standing for compulsory military service, for the setting up of an army pursuing any aims of conquest—a struggle with Japan, for instance. The Americans have the example of Europe to show them what this leads to. The American capitalists have stepped into this war in order to have an excuse, behind a smoke-screen of lofty ideals championing the rights of small nations, for building up a strong standing army....

How can the war be ended? If the Soviet were to assume power and the Germans continued the war—what would we do then? Anyone interested in the views of our Party could have read in *Pravda* the other day an exact quotation of what we said abroad as far back as 1915, namely, that if the revolutionary class in Russia, the working class, comes to power, it will have to offer peace. And if our terms are rejected by the German capitalists or by the capitalists of any other country, then that class will stand wholly for war. We are not suggesting that the war be ended at one blow. We do not promise that. We preach no such impossible and impracticable thing as that the war can be ended by the will of one side alone. Such promises are easy to give but impossible to fulfil. There is no easy way out of this terrible war. It has been going on for three years. You will go on fighting for ten years unless you accept the idea of a difficult and painful revolution. There is no other way out. We say: The war which the capitalist governments have started can only be ended by a workers' revolution. Those interested in the socialist movement should read the Basle Manifesto of 1912 adopted unanimously by all the socialist parties of the world, a manifesto that was published in our newspaper *Pravda*, a manifesto that can be published now in none of the belligerent countries, neither in "free" Britain nor in republican France, because it said the truth about war before the war. It said that there would be war between Britain and Germany as a result of capitalist competition. It said that so much powder had

accumulated that the guns would start shooting of their own accord. It told us what the war would be fought for, and said that the war would lead to a proletarian revolution. Therefore, we tell those socialists who signed this Manifesto and then went over to the side of their capitalist governments that they have betrayed socialism. There has been a split among the socialists all over the world. Some are in ministerial cabinets, others in prison. All over the world some socialists are preaching a war build-up, while others, like Eugene Debs, the American Bebel, who enjoys immense popularity among the American workers, say: "I'd rather be shot than give a cent towards the war. I'm willing to fight only the proletariat's war against the capitalists all over the world." That is how the socialists have split throughout the world. The world's social-patriots think they are defending their country. They are mistaken—they are defending the interests of one band of capitalists against another. We preach proletarian revolution—the only true cause, for which scores of people have gone to the scaffold, and hundreds and thousands have been thrown into prison. These imprisoned socialists are a minority, but the working class is for them, the whole course of economic development is for them. All this tells us that there is no other way out. The only way to end this war is by a workers' revolution in several countries. In the meantime we should make preparations for that revolution, we should assist it. For all its hatred of war and desire for peace, the Russian people could do nothing against the war, so long as it was being waged by the tsar, except work for a revolution against the tsar and for the tsar's overthrow. And that is what happened. History proved this to you yesterday and will prove it to you tomorrow. We said long ago that the mounting Russian revolution must be assisted. We said that at the end of 1914. Our Duma deputies were deported to Siberia⁵¹ for this, and we were told: "You are giving no answer. You talk about revolution when the strikes are off, when the deputies are doing hard labour, and when you haven't a single newspaper!" And we were accused of evading an answer. We heard those accusations for a number of years. We answered: You can be indignant about it, but so long as the tsar has not been overthrown we can do nothing against the war. And our prediction was justified. It is not fully justified yet, but it has already begun to receive justification. The revolution is beginning to change the war on Russia's part. The capitalists are still continuing the war, and we say: Until there is a workers' revolution in several

countries the war cannot be stopped, because the people who want that war are still in power. We are told: "In a number of countries everything seems to be asleep. In Germany all the socialists to a man are for the war, and Liebknecht is the only one against it." To this I say: This only one, Liebknecht, represents the working class. The hopes of all are in him alone, in his supporters, in the German proletariat. You don't believe this? Carry on with the war then! There is no other way. If you don't believe in Liebknecht, if you don't believe in the workers' revolution, a revolution that is coming to a head—if you don't believe this, then believe the capitalists!

Nothing but a workers' revolution in several countries can defeat this war. The war is not a game, it is an appalling thing taking toll of millions of lives, and it is not to be ended easily.

The soldiers at the front cannot tear the front away from the rest of the state and settle things their own way. The soldiers at the front are part of the country. So long as the country is at war the front will suffer along with the rest. Nothing can be done about it. The war has been brought about by the ruling classes and only a revolution of the working class can end it. Whether you will get a speedy peace or not depends on how the revolution will develop. Whatever sentimental things may be said, however much we may be told: Let us end the war immediately—this cannot be done without the development of the revolution. When power passes to the Soviets the capitalists will come out against us. Japan, France, Britain—the governments of all countries will be against us. The capitalists will be against, but the workers will be for us. That will be the end of the war which the capitalists started. There you have the answer to the question of how to end the war.

Vol. 24, pp. 398-413;
415-17; 418-21

From The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It

...Reference is constantly being made to the heroic patriotism and the miracles of military valour performed by the French in 1792-93. But the material, historical and economic conditions which alone made such miracles possible are forgotten. The suppression of obsolete feudalism in a really

revolutionary way, and the introduction throughout the country of a superior mode of production and free peasant land tenure, effected, moreover, with truly revolutionary-democratic speed, determination, energy and devotion—such were the material, economic conditions which with “miraculous” speed saved France by *regenerating* and *renovating* her economic foundation.

The example of France shows one thing, and one thing only, namely, that to render Russia capable of self-defence, to obtain in Russia, too, “miracles” of mass heroism, all that is obsolete must be swept away with “Jacobin” ruthlessness and Russia renovated and regenerated *economically*. And in the twentieth century this cannot be done merely by sweeping tsarism away (France did not confine herself to this 125 years ago). It cannot be done even by the mere revolutionary abolition of the landed estates (we have not even done that, for the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have betrayed the peasants), by the mere transfer of the land to the peasants. For we are living in the twentieth century, and mastery over the land *without mastery over the banks* cannot regenerate and renovate the life of the people.

The material, industrial renovation of France at the end of the eighteenth century was associated with a political and spiritual renovation, with the dictatorship of revolutionary democrats and the revolutionary proletariat (from which the democrats had not dissociated themselves and with which they were still almost fused), and with a ruthless war declared on everything reactionary. The whole people, and especially the masses, i.e., the *oppressed* classes, were swept up by boundless revolutionary enthusiasm; *everybody* considered the war a just war of defence, as it *actually was*. Revolutionary France was defending herself against reactionary monarchist Europe. It was not in 1792-93, but many years later, *after* the victory of reaction within the country, that the counter-revolutionary dictatorship of Napoleon turned France’s wars from defensive wars into wars of conquest.

And what about Russia? We continue to wage an imperialist war in the interests of the capitalists, in alliance with the imperialists and in accordance with the secret treaties the *tsar** concluded with the capitalists of Britain and other countries, promising the Russian capitalists in these treaties

* Nicholas II.—*Ed.*

the spoliation of foreign lands, of Constantinople, Lvov, Armenia, etc.

The war will remain an unjust, reactionary and predatory war on Russia's part as long as she does not propose a just peace and does not break with imperialism. The social character of the war, its true meaning, is not determined by the position of the enemy troops (as the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks think, stooping to the vulgarity of an ignorant yokel). What determines this character is the *policy* of which the war is a continuation ("war is the continuation of politics"), the *class* that is waging the war, and the aims for which it is waging this war.

You cannot lead the people into a predatory war in accordance with secret treaties and expect them to be enthusiastic. The foremost class in revolutionary Russia, the proletariat, is becoming increasingly aware of the criminal character of the war, and not only have the bourgeoisie been unable to shatter this popular conviction, but, on the contrary, awareness of the criminal character of the war is growing. The proletariat of both metropolitan cities⁵² of Russia has definitely become internationalist!

How, then, can you expect mass enthusiasm for the war!

One is inseparable from the other—home policy is inseparable from foreign policy. The country cannot be made capable of self-defence without the supreme heroism of the people in boldly and resolutely carrying out great economic transformations. And it is impossible to arouse popular heroism without breaking with imperialism, without proposing a democratic peace to all nations, and without thus turning the war from a criminal war of conquest and plunder into a just, revolutionary war of defence.

Only a thorough and consistent break with the capitalists in both home and foreign policy can save our revolution and our country, which is gripped in the iron vice of imperialism....

Written on September 10-14
(23-27), 1917

Vol. 25, pp. 365-67

From *Marxism and Insurrection*

...Having recognised the absolute necessity for an insurrection of the workers of Petrograd and Moscow in order to save the revolution and to save Russia from a "separate"

partition by the imperialists of both groups, we must first adapt our political tactics at the Conference to the conditions of the growing insurrection; secondly, we must show that it is not only in words that we accept Marx's idea that insurrection must be treated as an art.

At the Conference we must immediately cement the Bolshevik group, without striving after numbers, and without fearing to leave the waverers in the waverers' camp. They are more useful to the cause of the revolution *there* than in the camp of the resolute and devoted fighters.

We must draw up a brief declaration from the Bolsheviks, emphasising in no uncertain manner the irrelevance of long speeches and of "speeches" in general, the necessity for immediate action to save the revolution, the absolute necessity for a complete break with the bourgeoisie, for the removal of the present government, in its entirety, for a complete rupture with the Anglo-French imperialists, who are preparing a "separate" partition of Russia, and for the immediate transfer of all power to *revolutionary democrats, headed by the revolutionary proletariat.*

Our declaration must give the briefest and most trenchant formulation of *this* conclusion in connection with the programme proposals of peace for the peoples, land for the peasants, confiscation of scandalous profits, and a check on the scandalous sabotage of production by the capitalists.

The briefer and more trenchant the declaration, the better. Only two other highly important points must be clearly indicated in it, namely, that the people are worn out by the vacillations, that they are fed up with the irresolution of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks; and that we are definitely breaking with these *parties* because they have betrayed the revolution.

And another thing. By immediately proposing a peace without annexations, by immediately breaking with the Allied imperialists and with all imperialists, either we shall at once obtain an armistice, or the entire revolutionary proletariat will rally to the defence of the country, and a really just, really revolutionary war will then be waged by revolutionary democrats under the leadership of the proletariat.

Having read this declaration, and having appealed for *decisions* and not talk, for *action* and not resolution-writing, we must *dispatch* our entire group to the *factories and the barracks*. Their place is there, the pulse of life is there, there is the source of salvation for our revolution, and

there is the motive force of the Democratic Conference.

There, in ardent and impassioned speeches, we must explain our programme and put the alternative: either the Conference adopts it *in its entirety*, or else insurrection. There is no middle course. Delay is impossible. The revolution is dying.

By putting the question in this way, by concentrating our entire group in the factories and barracks, *we shall be able to determine the right moment to start the insurrection.*

In order to treat insurrection in a Marxist way, i.e., as an art, we must at the same time, without losing a single moment, organise a *headquarters* of the insurgent detachments, distribute our forces, move the reliable regiments to the most important points, surround the Alexandrinsky Theatre, occupy the Peter and Paul Fortress,⁵³ arrest the General Staff and the government, and move against the officer cadets and the Savage Division⁵⁴ those detachments which would rather die than allow the enemy to approach the strategic points of the city. We must mobilise the armed workers and call them to fight the last desperate fight, occupy the telegraph and the telephone exchange at once, move *our* insurrection headquarters to the central telephone exchange and connect it by telephone with all the factories, all the regiments, all the points of armed fighting, etc.

Of course, this is all by way of example, only to *illustrate* the fact that at the present moment it is impossible to remain loyal to Marxism, to remain loyal to the revolution *unless insurrection is treated as an art.*

N. Lenin

Written on September 13-14
(26-27), 1917

Vol. 26, pp. 25-27

From *Revision of the Party Programme*

In his draft Comrade Sokolnikov makes two theoretical errors on the question of wars of an imperialist nature.

First, he does not give an appreciation of the present war. He says that the imperialist epoch generates imperialist wars. This is correct and should, of course, be stated in the programme. But this is not enough. Besides this it is necessary to say that the present war of 1914-17 is imperialist. The German Spartacus group⁵⁵ in their "theses" published in German in

1915 advanced the proposition that in an era of imperialism national wars *are impossible*.^{*} This is obviously a wrong assertion, for imperialism makes the oppression of nations more acute and, as a result, national revolts and national wars (attempts to draw a line of demarcation between revolts and wars are doomed to failure) are not only possible and probable but absolutely inevitable.

Marxism demands a very precise assessment of each separate war on the basis of concrete data. To evade the question of the present war by resorting to general discussions is wrong in theory and inadmissible in practice. This method is used as a screen by the opportunists, they use it for evasion. They say that imperialism is, in general, an epoch of imperialist wars, but *this particular war is not wholly imperialist* (thus argued, for instance, Kautsky).

Secondly, Comrade Sokolnikov links "crises and wars", as if they were a two-in-one companion of capitalism in general, and of modern capitalism in particular. On pages 20 and 21 of the Moscow pamphlet, he repeats the "crises and wars" combination in his draft *three times*. Here it is not only a question of the undesirability of repetitions in the programme. It is also a question of incorrectness in principle.

Crises in the shape of overproduction, or "cessation of the sale of commodities", if Comrade Sokolnikov insists on banishing the word overproduction, are phenomena *exclusive* to capitalism. But wars are also characteristic of the slave-owning and serf systems of economy. Imperialist wars also occurred in the period of slavery (the war between Rome and Carthage was on both sides an imperialist war), as well as in the Middle Ages and in the epoch of mercantile capitalism. A war is certainly imperialist if *both* warring sides oppress foreign countries or nationalities, and are fighting for their share of the loot and for the right to "oppress and rob" more than the others.

If we were to say that only modern capitalism, only imperialism, has brought imperialist wars in its wake, it would be correct, for the preceding stage of capitalism, the stage of free competition, or the stage of pre-monopoly capitalism, was characterised in Western Europe mainly by *national* wars. But if we were to say that in the preceding stage there were no imperialist wars at all, it would be incorrect. It would

* See present edition, pp. 40-50.—Ed.

mean that we had forgotten the “colonial” wars, which are *also* imperialist. This is the first point.

And secondly, the *linking up* of “crises and wars” is particularly incorrect for these are quite different phenomena of different historical origin and different class significance. For instance, it would be wrong to say, as Comrade Sokolnikov says in his draft, that “both crises and wars, in turn, mean still greater ruin for the small producers and increase the dependence of hired labour on capital...”. For there could possibly be wars fought for the emancipation of hired labour from capital. In the course of the struggle of wage-workers against the capitalist class, wars of a revolutionary and not only of a reactionary-imperialist nature are possible. War is the continuation of the politics of this or that class; and in every class society, slave-owning, feudal, or capitalist, there have been wars which continued the politics of the oppressor classes and also wars which continued the politics of the oppressed classes. This is exactly why it would be wrong to say, as Comrade Sokolnikov does, that “crises and wars show that the capitalist system is changing from a form of the development of productive forces into a hindrance to it”.

It is true that the present imperialist war, by its reactionary character and the hardships it entails, revolutionises the masses and accelerates the revolution, and this must be stated. It is also true that imperialist wars in general are *typical* of an imperialist epoch, and this may be mentioned. But it would be wrong to say this about all “wars” in general, and, moreover, under no circumstances should crises and wars be tied up together....

Written on October 6-8
(19-21), 1917

Vol. 26, pp. 161-63

A Painful but Necessary Lesson

The week from February 18 to 24, 1918, has been one that will be remembered as a great turning-point in the history of the Russian—and the international—revolution.

On February 27, 1917, the Russian proletariat, jointly with part of the peasantry who had been aroused by the course the war was taking, and also with the bourgeoisie, overthrew the monarchy. On April 21, 1917, the proletariat overthrew the absolute rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie and shifted

power into the hands of the petty-bourgeois advocates of compromise with the bourgeoisie. On July 3, the urban proletariat gave the compromisers' government a severe shock by its spontaneous demonstration. On October 25, it overthrew that government and established the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry.

This victory had to be defended in civil war. It took about three months, beginning with the victory over Kerensky near Gatchina, continued in the victories over the bourgeoisie, the officer cadets and part of the counter-revolutionary Cossacks in Moscow, Irkutsk, Orenburg and Kiev, and ending with the victory over Kaledin, Kornilov and Alexeyev at Rostov-on-Don.

The fire of proletarian insurrection flared up in Finland, and the conflagration spread to Rumania.

Victories on the home front were achieved with relative ease since the enemy did not possess any material or organisational advantage, and, furthermore, did not have any sound economic basis or any support among the masses. The ease with which these victories were gained was bound to turn the heads of many leaders. Their attitude has been: "We'll have a walk-over."

They have disregarded the widespread disintegration of the army, which is rapidly demobilising itself and abandoning the front. They have become intoxicated with revolutionary phrases. They have applied them to the struggle against world imperialism. They have mistaken Russia's temporary "freedom" from imperialist pressure for something normal, although actually that "freedom" was due only to an interruption in the war between the German and Anglo-French plunderers. They have mistaken the mass strikes that are beginning in Austria and Germany for a revolution that is supposed to have delivered us from any serious danger from German imperialism. Instead of serious, effective, sustained work to aid the German revolution, which is coming to birth in a particularly difficult and painful manner, we have had people waving their arms—"what can those German imperialists do—with Liebknecht on our side we'll kick them out in no time!"

The week from February 18 to February 24, 1918, from the capture of Dvinsk to the capture of Pskov (later recaptured), the week of imperialist Germany's military offensive against the Soviet Socialist Republic, has been a bitter, distressing, and painful lesson, but it has been a necessary, useful and

beneficial one. How highly instructive it has been to compare the two groups of telegraphic and telephonic communications that have reached the central government in the past week! On the one hand there has been the unrestrained flood of "resolution-type" revolutionary phrases—one might call them Steinberg phrases, if one recalls a chef-d'œuvre in that style, the speech of the "Left" (hm ... hm) Socialist-Revolutionary⁵⁶ Steinberg at the Saturday meeting of the Central Executive Committee. On the other hand there have been the painful and humiliating reports of regiments refusing to retain their positions, of refusal to defend even the Narva Line, and of disobedience to the order to destroy everything in the event of a retreat, not to mention the running away, the chaos, ineptitude, helplessness and slovenliness.

A bitter, distressing, painful but necessary, useful and beneficial lesson!

The thoughtful, class-conscious worker will draw three conclusions from this historic lesson—on our attitude to the defence of the fatherland, its defence potential and to socialist revolutionary war; on the conditions under which we may come into collision with world imperialism; on the correct presentation of the question of our attitude to the world socialist movement.

We are and have been defencists since October 25, 1917, we champion the defence of the fatherland ever since that day. That is because we have shown *by deeds* that we have broken away from imperialism. We have denounced and published the filthy, bloodstained treaties of the imperialist plotters. We have overthrown *our own* bourgeoisie. We have given freedom to the peoples we formerly oppressed. We have given land to the people and introduced workers' control. We are in favour of defending the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

And because we are in favour of defending the fatherland we demand a *serious* attitude towards the country's defence potential and preparedness for war. We declare a ruthless war against revolutionary phrases about revolutionary war. There must be a lengthy, serious preparation for it, beginning with economic progress, the restoration of the railways (for without them modern warfare is an empty phrase) and with the establishment of the strictest revolutionary discipline and self-discipline everywhere.

From the point of view of the defence of the fatherland it would be a crime to enter into an armed conflict with an

infinitely superior and well-prepared enemy when we obviously have no army. From the point of view of the defence of the fatherland we have to conclude the most harsh, oppressive, brutal, disgraceful peace—not in order to “capitulate” to imperialism but in order to learn and prepare to fight against imperialism in a serious and effective manner.

The past week has raised the Russian revolution to an immeasurably higher level of historical development. In the course of it history has progressed, has ascended several steps at once.

Until now we have been faced with miserable, despicable (from the standpoint of world imperialism) enemies, an idiot called Romanov, Kerensky the boaster, gangs of officer cadets and bourgeois. Now there has arisen against us the giant of world imperialism, a splendidly organised and technically well-equipped, civilised giant. That giant *must* be fought. And one must *know how* to fight him. A peasant country that has been subjected to unparalleled devastation by three years of war and that has begun the socialist revolution, must avoid armed conflicts—must avoid them while it is still possible, even at the cost of huge sacrifices—in order to be able to do something worthwhile before the “last, decisive battle” begins.

That battle will begin only when the socialist revolution breaks out in the leading imperialist countries. That revolution is undoubtedly maturing and growing stronger month by month, week by week. That growing strength *must* be helped. And we have to *know how* to help it. It would harm and not help that growing strength if we were to give up the neighbouring Soviet Socialist Republic to destruction at a moment when it obviously has no army.

We must not turn into an empty phrase the great slogan “We bank on the victory of socialism in Europe”. It is a true slogan if we have in mind the long and difficult path to the full victory of socialism. It is an indisputable philosophic-historical truth in respect of the entire “era of the socialist revolution”. But any abstract truth becomes an empty phrase if it is applied to *any* concrete situation. It is indisputable that “every strike conceals the hydra of the social revolution”. But it is nonsense to think that we can stride directly from a strike to the revolution. If we “bank on the victory of socialism in Europe” in the sense that we guarantee to the people that the European revolution will break out and is certain to be victorious within the next few weeks, certainly before the

Germans have time to reach Petrograd, Moscow or Kiev, before they have time to "finish off" our railway transport, we shall be acting not as serious internationalist revolutionaries, but as adventurers.

If Liebknecht is victorious over the bourgeoisie in two or three weeks (it is not impossible), he will get us out of all difficulties. That is beyond doubt. If, however, we determine our tactics for today in the struggle against the imperialism of today in the hope that Liebknecht will probably be victorious within the next weeks, we shall deserve nothing but ridicule. We shall be turning the greatest revolutionary slogans of the present day into an empty revolutionary phrase.

Worker comrades, learn from the painful but useful lessons of the revolution! Prepare seriously, vigorously and unwaveringly to defend the fatherland, to defend the Soviet Socialist Republic!

Pravda (evening edition) No. 35,
February 25 (12), 1918

Vol. 27, pp. 62-66

Resolution on War and Peace
March 8, 1918
Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P(B.)

The Congress recognises the necessity to confirm the extremely harsh, humiliating peace treaty with Germany that has been concluded by Soviet power in view of our lack of an army, in view of the most unhealthy state of the demoralised army at the front, in view of the need to take advantage of any, even the slightest, possibility of obtaining a respite before imperialism launches its offensive against the Soviet Socialist Republic.

In the present period of the era that has begun, the era of the socialist revolution, numerous military attacks on Soviet Russia by the imperialist powers (both from the West and from the East) are historically inevitable. The historical inevitability of such attacks at a time when both internal, class relations and international relations are extremely tense, can at any moment, even immediately, within the next few days, lead to fresh imperialist aggressive wars against the socialist movement in general and against the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic in particular.

The Congress therefore declares that it recognises the

primary and fundamental task of our Party, of the entire vanguard of the class-conscious proletariat and of Soviet power, to be the adoption of the most energetic, ruthlessly determined and Draconian measures to improve the self-discipline and discipline of the workers and peasants of Russia, to explain the inevitability of Russia's historic advance towards a socialist, patriotic war of liberation, to create everywhere soundly co-ordinated mass organisations held together by a single iron will, organisations that are capable of concerted, valorous action in their day-to-day efforts and especially at critical moments in the life of the people, and, lastly, to train systematically and comprehensively in military matters and military operations the entire adult population of both sexes.

The Congress considers the only reliable guarantee of consolidation of the socialist revolution that has been victorious in Russia to be its conversion into a world working-class revolution.

The Congress is confident that the step taken by Soviet power in view of the present alignment of forces in the world arena was, from the standpoint of the interests of the world revolution, inevitable and necessary.

Confident that the working-class revolution is maturing persistently in all belligerent countries and is preparing the full and inevitable defeat of imperialism, the Congress declares that the socialist proletariat of Russia will support the fraternal revolutionary movement of the proletariat of all countries with all its strength and with every means at its disposal.

Vol. 27, pp. 118-19

From "Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality

To recognise defence of the fatherland means recognising the legitimacy and justice of war. Legitimacy and justice from what point of view? Only from the point of view of the socialist proletariat and its struggle for its emancipation. We do not recognise any other point of view. If war is waged by the exploiting class with the object of strengthening its rule as a class, such a war is a criminal war, and "defencism" in *such* a war is a base betrayal of socialism. If war is waged by the proletariat after it has conquered the bourgeoisie in its own country, and is waged with the object of strengthening

and developing socialism, such a war is legitimate and "holy".

We have been "defencists" since October 25, 1917. I have said this more than once very definitely, and you dare not deny this. It is precisely in the interests of "strengthening the connection" with international socialism that we *are in duty bound* to defend our *socialist* fatherland. Those who treat frivolously the defence of the country in which the proletariat has already achieved victory are the ones who destroy the connection with international socialism. When we were the representatives of an oppressed class we did not adopt a frivolous attitude towards defence of the fatherland in an imperialist war. We opposed such defence on principle. Now that we have become representatives of the ruling class, which has begun to organise socialism, we demand that everybody adopt a *serious* attitude towards defence of the country. And adopting a serious attitude towards defence of the country means thoroughly preparing for it, and strictly calculating the balance of forces. If our forces are obviously small, the best means of defence is *retreat into the interior of the country* (anyone who regards this as an artificial formula, made up to suit the needs of the moment, should read old Clausewitz, one of the greatest authorities on military matters, concerning the lessons of history to be learned in this connection). The "Left Communists",⁵⁷ however, do not give the slightest indication that they understand the significance of the question of the balance of forces.

When we were opposed to defencism on principle we were justified in holding up to ridicule those who wanted to "save" their fatherland, ostensibly in the interests of socialism. When we gained the right to be proletarian defencists the whole question was radically altered. It has become our duty to calculate with the utmost accuracy the different forces involved, to weigh with the utmost care the chances of our ally (the international proletariat) being able to come to our aid in time. It is in the interest of capital to destroy its enemy (the revolutionary proletariat) bit by bit, before the workers in all countries have united (actually united, i.e., by beginning the revolution). It is in our interest to do all that is possible, to take advantage of the slightest opportunity to postpone the decisive battle until the moment (or *until after* the moment) the revolutionary workers' contingents have united in a single great international army....

Written on May 5, 1918

Vol. 27, pp. 331-33

Prophetic Words

Nobody, thank God, believes in miracles nowadays. Miraculous prophecy is a fairy-tale. But scientific prophecy is a fact. And in these days, when we so very often encounter shameful despondency and even despair around us, it is useful to recall one scientific prophecy which has come true.

Frederick Engels had occasion in 1887 to write of the coming world war in a preface to a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim, *In Memory of the German Arch-Patriots of 1806-1807 (Zur Erinnerung für die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806 - 1807)*. (This pamphlet is No. XXIV of the Social-Democratic Library published in Göttingen-Zürich in 1888.)

This is how Frederick Engels spoke over thirty years ago of the future world war:

"...No war is any longer possible for Prussia-Germany except a world war and a world war indeed of an extent and violence hitherto undreamt of. Eight to ten millions of soldiers will massacre one another and in doing so devour the whole of Europe until they have stripped it barer than any swarm of locusts has ever done. The devastations of the Thirty Years' War⁵⁸ compressed into three or four years, and spread over the whole Continent; famine, pestilence, general demoralisation both of the armies and of the mass of the people produced by acute distress; hopeless confusion of our artificial machinery in trade, industry and credit, ending in general bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional state wisdom to such an extent that crowns will roll by dozens on the pavement and there will be nobody to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end and who will come out of the struggle as victor; only one result is absolutely certain: general exhaustion and the establishment of the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class.

"This is the prospect when the system of mutual outbidding in armaments, taken to the final extreme, at last bears its inevitable fruits. This, my lords, princes and statesmen, is where in your wisdom you have brought old Europe. And when nothing more remains to you but to open the last great war dance—that will suit us all right (*uns kann es recht sein*). The war may perhaps push us temporarily into the background, may wrench from us many a position already conquered. But when you have unfettered forces which you will then no longer be able again to control, things may go as they will: at the end of the tragedy you will be ruined and the victory

of the proletariat will either be already achieved or at any rate (*doch*) inevitable.

“London, December 15, 1887

Frederick Engels”*

What genius is displayed in this prophecy! And how infinitely rich in ideas is every sentence of this exact, clear, brief and scientific class analysis! How much could be learnt from it by those who are now shamefully succumbing to lack of faith, despondency and despair, if ... if people who are accustomed to kowtow to the bourgeoisie, or who allow themselves to be frightened by it, could but think, were but capable of thinking!

Some of Engels's predictions have turned out differently; and one could not expect the world and capitalism to have remained unchanged during thirty years of frenzied imperialist development. But what is most astonishing is that so many of Engels's predictions are turning out “to the letter”. For Engels gave a perfectly exact class analysis, and classes and the relations between them have remained unchanged.

“...The war may perhaps push us temporarily into the background....” Developments have proceeded exactly along these lines, but have gone even further and even worse: some of the social-chauvinists who have been “pushed back”, and their spineless “semi-opponents”, the Kautskyites, have begun to extol their backward movement and have become direct traitors to and betrayers of socialism.

“...The war may perhaps wrench from us many a position already conquered....” A number of “legal” positions have been wrenched from the working class. But on the other hand it has been steeled by trials and is receiving severe but salutary lessons in illegal organisation, in illegal struggle and in preparing its forces for a revolutionary attack.

“...Crowns will roll by dozens....” Several crowns have already fallen. And one of them is worth dozens of others—the crown of the autocrat of all the Russias, Nicholas Romanov.

“...Absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end....” After four years of war this absolute impossibility has, if one may say so, become even more absolute.

“...Hopeless confusion of our artificial machinery in trade, industry and credit....” At the end of the fourth year of war this has been fully borne out in the case of one of the biggest and

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 21, S. 350-51. — Ed.

most backward of the states drawn into the war by the capitalists—Russia. But do not the growing starvation in Germany and Austria, the shortage of clothing and raw material and the wearing out of the means of production show that a similar state of affairs is very rapidly overtaking other countries as well?

Engels depicts the consequences brought about only by “foreign” war; he does not deal with internal, i.e., civil war, without which not one of the great revolutions of history has taken place, and without which not a single serious Marxist has conceived the transition from capitalism to socialism. And while a foreign war may drag on for a certain time without causing “hopeless confusion” in the “artificial machinery” of capitalism, it is obvious that a civil war without such a consequence is quite inconceivable.

What stupidity, what spinelessness—not to say mercenary service to the bourgeoisie—is displayed by those who, like our *Novaya Zhizn* group,⁵⁹ Mensheviks, Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., while continuing to call themselves “socialists”, maliciously point to the manifestation of this “hopeless confusion” and lay the blame for everything on the revolutionary proletariat, the Soviet power, the “utopia” of the transition to socialism. The “confusion”, or *razrukha*,* to use the excellent Russian word, has been brought about by the war. There can be no severe war without disruption. There can be no civil war—the inevitable condition and concomitant of socialist revolution—without disruption. To renounce revolution and socialism “in view of” the disruption, only means to display one’s lack of principle and in practice to desert to the bourgeoisie.

“...Famine, pestilence, general demoralisation both of the armies and of the mass of the people produced by acute distress....”

How simply and clearly Engels draws this indisputable conclusion, which must be obvious to everyone who is at all capable of reflecting on the objective consequences of many years of severe and agonising war. And how astonishingly stupid are those numerous “Social-Democrats” and pseudo-Socialists who will not or cannot realise this most simple idea.

Is it conceivable that a war can last many years without both the armies and the mass of the people becoming demoral-

* Dislocation, disruption.—*Ed.*

ised? Of course not. Such a consequence of a long war is absolutely inevitable over a period of several years, if not a whole generation. And our "men in mufflers"⁶⁰, the bourgeois intellectual snivelers who call themselves "Social-Democrats" and "Socialists", second the bourgeoisie in blaming the revolution for the manifestations of demoralisation or for the inevitable severity of the measures taken to combat particularly acute cases of demoralisation—although it is as clear as noonday that this demoralisation has been produced by the imperialist war, and that no revolution can rid itself of such consequences of war without a long struggle and without a number of stern measures of repression.

Our sugary writers in *Novaya Zhizn*, *Vperyod*⁶¹ or *Dyelo Naroda*⁶² are prepared to grant a revolution of the proletariat and other oppressed classes "theoretically", provided only that the revolution drops from heaven and is not born and bred on earth soaked in the blood of four years of imperialist butchery of the peoples, with millions upon millions of people exhausted, tormented and demoralised by this butchery.

They had heard and admitted "in theory" that a revolution should be compared to an act of childbirth; but when it came to the point, they disgracefully took fright and their fainthearted whimperings echoed the malicious outbursts of the bourgeoisie against the insurrection of the proletariat. Consider the descriptions of childbirth given in literature, when the authors aim at presenting a truthful picture of the severity, pain and horror of the act of travail, as in Emile Zola's *La joie de vivre* (The Joy of Life), for instance, or in Veresayev's *Notes of a Doctor*. Human childbirth is an act which transforms the woman into an almost lifeless, blood-stained heap of flesh, tortured, tormented and driven frantic by pain. But can the "individual" that sees *only* this in love and its sequel, in the transformation of the woman into a mother, be regarded as a human being? Who would renounce love and procreation for *this* reason?

Travail may be light or severe. Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, always said that the transition from capitalism to socialism would be inevitably accompanied by *prolonged birth pangs*. And analysing the consequences of a world war, Engels outlines simply and clearly the indisputable and obvious fact that a revolution that follows and is connected with a war (and still more—let us add for our part—a revolution which breaks out during a war, and which

is obliged to grow and maintain itself in the midst of a world war) is a *particularly severe* case of childbirth.

Clearly realising this, Engels speaks with great caution of socialism being brought to birth by a capitalist society which is perishing in a world war. "Only one result [of a world war]," he says, "is absolutely certain: general exhaustion and the *establishment* of the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class."

This thought is expressed even more clearly at the end of the preface we are examining.

"...At the end of the tragedy you (the capitalists and land-owners, the kings and statesmen of the bourgeoisie) will be ruined and the victory of the proletariat will either be already achieved or at any rate inevitable."

Severe travail greatly increases the danger of grave illness or of a fatal issue. But while individuals may die in the act of childbirth, the new society to which the old system gives birth cannot die; all that may happen is that the birth may be more painful, more prolonged, and growth and development slower.

The war has not yet ended. General exhaustion has already set in. As regards the two *direct* results of war predicted by Engels conditionally (either the victory of the working class already achieved, or the establishment of conditions which will make this inevitable, *despite all difficulties*), as regards these two conditions, now, in the middle of 1918, we find *both* in evidence.

In one, the least developed, of the capitalist countries, the victory of the working class *is already achieved*. In the others, with unparalleled pain and effort, the conditions are being established which will make this victory "at any rate inevitable".

Let the "socialist" snivelers croak, let the bourgeoisie rage and fume, but only people who shut their eyes so as not to see, and stuff their ears so as not to hear, can fail to notice that all over the world the birth pangs of the old, capitalist society, which is pregnant with socialism, have begun. Our country, which has temporarily been advanced by the march of events to the van of the socialist revolution, is undergoing the particularly severe pains of the first period of travail. We have every reason to face the future with complete assurance and absolute confidence, for it is preparing for us new allies and new victories of the socialist revolution in a number of the more advanced countries. We are entitled to be proud and

to consider ourselves fortunate that it has come to our lot to be the first to fell in one part of the globe that wild beast, capitalism, which has drenched the earth in blood, which has reduced humanity to starvation and demoralisation, and which will assuredly perish soon, no matter how monstrous and savage its frenzy in the face of death.

June 29, 1918

Pravda, No. 133,
July 2, 1918

Vol. 27, pp. 494-99

*Speech at a Meeting
of the Warsaw Revolutionary Regiment*

August 2, 1918

Newspaper Report

(Comrade Lenin's appearance in the hall is greeted with enthusiastic applause and the "Internationale".) We Polish and Russian revolutionaries are now burning with one desire—to do everything to defend the gains of the first mighty socialist revolution, which will inevitably be followed by a series of revolutions in other countries. Our difficulty is that we had to take action much earlier than the workers of the more cultured, more civilised countries.

The world war was caused by the forces of international capital, of two coalitions of vultures. For four years the world has been drenched in blood in order to settle which of these two rapacious imperialist groups shall rule the globe. We feel and sense that this criminal war cannot end in victory for either of them. It is becoming clearer every day that a victorious workers' revolution, not the imperialists, can end it. And the worse the position of the workers now becomes in all countries, and the more ferociously proletarian free speech is persecuted, the more desperate the bourgeoisie get, for they cannot cope with the growing movement. We have for a time forged ahead of the main body of the socialist army, which is full of hope as it watches us and says to its bourgeoisie: however much you rant and rage, we shall follow the Russian example and do what the Russian Bolsheviks have done.

We wanted peace. It was just because Soviet Russia proposed peace to the whole world that in February German troops attacked us. Now, however, we see with our own eyes that one imperialism is no better than the other. Both of them have lied, and lie now when they say they are waging a war of lib-

eration. Anglo-French capital is showing itself up just as robber Germany once did with the utterly shameful Brest Peace. The British and French are now making their last bid to draw us into the war. For fifteen million, through generals and other officers, they have now bought new lackeys, the Czechs, so as to involve them in the rash adventure and turn the Czechoslovak revolt into a white-guard-landlord movement.⁶³ And strange to say, all this is apparently being done to "defend" Russia. The "freedom-loving" and "fair" British oppress all and sundry, seize Murmansk, British cruisers come right up to Archangel and bombard the coastal batteries—all to "defend" Russia. Quite obviously they want to encircle Russia in a ring of imperialist plunderers and crush her for having exposed and torn up their secret treaties.

Our revolution has resulted in the workers of Britain and France indicting their government. In Britain, where civil peace has prevailed and where the workers' resistance to socialism has been strongest, for they too have had a hand in plundering the colonies, the workers are now veering round and breaking the civil peace with the bourgeoisie.

The workers of France are condemning the policy of intervention in Russia's affairs. That is why the capitalists of these countries are staking everything they have.

The fact of Soviet Russia's existence and vitality is driving them mad.

We know the war is coming to an end; we know they cannot finish it; we know we have a reliable ally. We must therefore exert all our energy and make a last effort. Either the rule of the proletariat or the rule of the kulaks, capitalists and the tsar, as was the case in the unsuccessful revolutions in the West. As you go to the front you must remember above all that this war alone, the war of the oppressed and exploited against the violators and plunderers, is legitimate, just and sacred.

An alliance is coming into being between the revolutionaries of different nations—something that the finest people have dreamt of; a real alliance of workers, and not intellectual dreamers.

The guarantee of victory lies in overcoming national hatred and mistrust.

It is your great privilege to uphold sacred ideas arms in hand, and to make international brotherhood of nations a reality by fighting together with your front-line enemies of yesterday—Germans, Austrians and Magyars.

And, comrades, I am confident that if you muster all your military forces and set up a mighty international Red Army, and hurl these iron battalions against the exploiters and oppressors, against the reactionary thugs of the whole world, making your battle cry "Victory or Death!"—no imperialist force will be able to hold us! (*Lenin's concluding words are drowned in prolonged and stormy applause.*)

Vol. 28, pp. 37-39

From *Letter to American Workers*

Comrades! A Russian Bolshevik who took part in the 1905 Revolution, and who lived in your country for many years afterwards, has offered to convey my letter to you. I have accepted his proposal all the more gladly because just at the present time the American revolutionary workers have to play an exceptionally important role as uncompromising enemies of American imperialism—the freshest, strongest and latest in joining in the world-wide slaughter of nations for the division of capitalist profits. At this very moment, the American multimillionaires, these modern slave-owners, have turned an exceptionally tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism by giving their approval—whether direct or indirect, open or hypocritically concealed, makes no difference—to the armed expedition launched by the brutal Anglo-Japanese imperialists for the purpose of throttling the first socialist republic.

The history of modern, civilised America opened with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few compared to the vast number of wars of conquest which, like the present imperialist war, were caused by squabbles among kings, landowners or capitalists over the division of usurped lands or ill-gotten gains. That was the war the American people waged against the British robbers who oppressed America and held her in colonial slavery, in the same way as these "civilised" bloodsuckers are still oppressing and holding in colonial slavery hundreds of millions of people in India, Egypt, and all parts of the world.

About 150 years have passed since then. Bourgeois civilisation has borne all its luxurious fruits. America has taken first place among the free and educated nations in level of development of the productive forces of collective human

endeavour, in the utilisation of machinery and of all the wonders of modern engineering. At the same time, America has become one of the foremost countries in regard to the depth of the abyss which lies between the handful of arrogant multimillionaires who wallow in filth and luxury, and the millions of working people who constantly live on the verge of pauperism. The American people, who set the world an example in waging a revolutionary war against feudal slavery, now find themselves in the latest, capitalist stage of wage-slavery to a handful of multimillionaires, and find themselves playing the role of hired thugs who, for the benefit of wealthy scoundrels, throttled the Philippines in 1898 on the pretext of "liberating" them,⁶⁴ and are throttling the Russian Socialist Republic in 1918 on the pretext of "protecting" it from the Germans.

The four years of the imperialist slaughter of nations, however, have not passed in vain. The deception of the people by the scoundrels of both robber groups, the British and the German, has been utterly exposed by indisputable and obvious facts. The results of the four years of war have revealed the general law of capitalism as applied to war between robbers for the division of spoils: the richest and strongest profited and grabbed most, while the weakest were utterly robbed, tormented, crushed and strangled.

The British imperialist robbers were the strongest in number of "colonial slaves". The British capitalists have not lost an inch of "their" territory (i.e., territory they have grabbed over the centuries), but they have grabbed all the German colonies in Africa, they have grabbed Mesopotamia and Palestine, they have throttled Greece, and have begun to plunder Russia.

The German imperialist robbers were the strongest in organisation and discipline of "their" armies, but weaker in regard to colonies. They have lost all their colonies, but plundered half of Europe and throttled the largest number of small countries and weak nations. What a great war of "liberation" on both sides! How well the robbers of both groups, the Anglo-French and the German capitalists, together with their lackeys, the social-chauvinists, i.e., the socialists who went over to the side of "*their own*" bourgeoisie, have "defended their country"!

The American multimillionaires were, perhaps, richest of all, and geographically the most secure. They have profited more than all the rest. They have converted all, even the richest, countries into their tributaries. They have grabbed hundreds

of billions of dollars. And every dollar is sullied with filth: the filth of the secret treaties between Britain and her "allies", between Germany and her vassals, treaties for the division of the spoils, treaties of mutual "aid" for oppressing the workers and persecuting the internationalist socialists. Every dollar is sullied with the filth of "profitable" war contracts, which in every country made the rich richer and the poor poorer. And every dollar is stained with blood—from that ocean of blood that has been shed by the ten million killed and twenty million maimed in the great, noble, liberating and holy war to decide whether the British or the German robbers are to get most of the spoils, whether the British or the German thugs are to be *foremost* in throttling the weak nations all over the world.

While the German robbers broke all records in war atrocities, the British have broken all records not only in the number of colonies they have grabbed, but also in the subtlety of their disgusting hypocrisy. This very day, the Anglo-French and American bourgeois newspapers are spreading, in millions and millions of copies, lies and slander about Russia, and are hypocritically justifying their predatory expedition against her on the plea that they want to "protect" Russia from the Germans!

It does not require many words to refute this despicable and hideous lie; it is sufficient to point to one well-known fact. In October 1917, after the Russian workers had overthrown their imperialist government, the Soviet government, the government of the revolutionary workers and peasants, openly proposed a just peace, a peace without annexations or indemnities, a peace that fully guaranteed equal rights to all nations—and it proposed such a peace to *all* the belligerent countries.

It was the Anglo-French and the American bourgeoisie who refused to accept our proposal; it was they who even refused to talk to us about a general peace! It was *they* who betrayed the interests of all nations; it was *they* who prolonged the imperialist slaughter!

It was *they* who, banking on the possibility of dragging Russia back into the imperialist war, refused to take part in the peace negotiations and thereby gave a free hand to the no less predatory German capitalists who imposed the annexationist and harsh Brest Peace upon Russia!

It is difficult to imagine anything more disgusting than the hypocrisy with which the Anglo-French and Americanbour-

geoisie are now “blaming” us *for* the Brest Peace Treaty. The very capitalists of those countries which could have turned the Brest negotiations into general negotiations for a general peace are now our “accusers”! The Anglo-French imperialist vultures, who have profited from the plunder of colonies and the slaughter of nations, have prolonged the war for nearly a whole year after Brest, and yet they “accuse” *us*, the Bolsheviks, who proposed a just peace to all countries, they accuse *us*, who tore up, published and exposed to public disgrace the secret, criminal treaties concluded between the ex-tsar* and the Anglo-French capitalists.

The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live, greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains — for breaking through to freedom, and making the heaviest sacrifices in doing so — for, as a socialist republic, although torn and plundered by the imperialists, keeping *out* of the imperialist war and raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.

Small wonder that the international imperialist gang hates us for this, that it “accuses” us, that all the lackeys of the imperialists, including our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, also “accuse” us. The hatred these watchdogs of imperialism express for the Bolsheviks, and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of the world, convince us more than ever of the justice of our cause.

A real socialist would not fail to understand that for the sake of achieving victory over the bourgeoisie, for the sake of power passing to the workers, for the sake of *starting* the world proletarian revolution, we *cannot* and must *not* hesitate to make the heaviest sacrifices, including the sacrifice of part of our territory, the sacrifice of heavy defeats at the hands of imperialism. A real socialist would have proved by *deeds* his willingness for “his” country to make the greatest sacrifice to give a real push forward to the cause of the socialist revolution.

For the sake of “their” cause, that is, for the sake of winning world hegemony, the imperialists of Britain and Germany have not hesitated to utterly ruin and throttle a whole number of countries, from Belgium and Serbia to Palestine and Mesopotamia. But must socialists wait with “their” cause, the cause

* Nicholas II. — Ed.

of liberating the working people of the whole world from the yoke of capital, of winning universal and lasting peace, until a path without sacrifice is found? Must they fear to open the battle until an easy victory is "guaranteed"? Must they place the integrity and security of "their" bourgeois-created "fatherland" above the interests of the world socialist revolution? The scoundrels in the international socialist movement who think this way, those lackeys who grovel to bourgeois morality, thrice stand condemned.

The Anglo-French and American imperialist vultures "accuse" us of concluding an "agreement" with German imperialism. What hypocrites, what scoundrels they are to slander the workers' government while trembling because of the sympathy displayed towards us by the workers of "their own" countries! But their hypocrisy will be exposed. They pretend not to see the difference between an agreement entered into by "socialists" with the bourgeoisie (their own or foreign) *against the workers*, against the working people, and an agreement entered into *for the protection* of the workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with the bourgeoisie of one national colour *against the bourgeoisie* of another colour in order that the proletariat may take advantage of the antagonisms between the different groups of bourgeoisie.

In actual fact, every European sees this difference very well, and, as I shall show in a moment, the American people have had a particularly striking "illustration" of it in their own history. There are agreements and agreements, there are *fagots et fagots*, as the French say.

When in February 1918 the German imperialist vultures hurled their forces against unarmed, demobilised Russia, who had relied on the international solidarity of the proletariat before the world revolution had fully matured, I did not hesitate for a moment to enter into an "agreement" with the French monarchists. Captain Sadoul, a French army officer who, in words, sympathised with the Bolsheviks, but was in deeds a loyal and faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to see me. "I am a monarchist. My only aim is to secure the defeat of Germany," de Lubersac declared to me. "That goes without saying (*cela va sans dire*)," I replied. But this did not in the least prevent me from entering into an "agreement" with de Lubersac concerning certain services that French army officers, experts in explosives, were ready to render us by blowing up railway lines in order to hinder the German invasion. This

is an example of an "agreement" of which every class-conscious worker will approve, an agreement in the interests of socialism. The French monarchist and I shook hands, although we knew that each of us would willingly hang his "partner". But for a time our interests coincided. Against the advancing rapacious Germans, we, in the interests of the Russian and the world socialist revolution, utilised the equally rapacious counter-interests of *other* imperialists. In this way we served the interests of the working class of Russia and of other countries, we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the whole world, we resorted to the methods, most legitimate and essential in *every* war, of manoeuvre, stratagem, retreat, in anticipation of the moment when the rapidly maturing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries *completely matured*.

However much the Anglo-French and American imperialist sharks fume with rage, however much they slander us, no matter how many millions they spend on bribing the Right Socialist-Revolutionary, Menshevik and other social-patriotic newspapers, *I shall not hesitate one second* to enter into a *similar* "agreement" with the German imperialist vultures if an attack upon Russia by Anglo-French troops calls for it. And I know perfectly well that my tactics will be approved by the class-conscious proletariat of Russia, Germany, France, Britain, America—in short, of the whole civilised world. Such tactics will ease the task of the socialist revolution, will hasten it, will weaken the international bourgeoisie, will strengthen the position of the working class which is defeating the bourgeoisie.

The American people resorted to these tactics long ago to the advantage of their revolution. When they waged their great war of liberation against the British oppressors, they had also against them the French and the Spanish oppressors who owned a part of what is now the United States of North America. In their arduous war for freedom, the American people also entered into "agreements" with some oppressors against others for the purpose of weakening the oppressors and strengthening those who were fighting in a revolutionary manner against oppression, for the purpose of serving the interests of the oppressed *people*. The American people took advantage of the strife between the French, the Spanish and the British; sometimes they even fought side by side with the forces of the French and Spanish oppressors against the British oppressors; first they defeated the British and then freed

themselves (partly by ransom) from the French and the Spanish.

Historical action is not the pavement of Nevsky Prospekt, said the great Russian revolutionary Chernyshevsky. A revolutionary would not "agree" to a proletarian revolution only "on the condition" that it proceeds easily and smoothly, that there is, from the outset, combined action on the part of the proletarians of different countries, that there are guarantees against defeats, that the road of the revolution is broad, free and straight, that it will not be necessary during the march to victory to sustain the heaviest casualties, to "bide one's time in a besieged fortress", or to make one's way along extremely narrow, impassable, winding and dangerous mountain tracks. Such a person is no revolutionary, he has not freed himself from the pedantry of the bourgeois intellectuals; such a person will be found constantly slipping into the camp of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, like our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and even (although more rarely) Left Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Echoing the bourgeoisie, these gentlemen like to blame us for the "chaos" of the revolution, for the "destruction" of industry, for the unemployment and the food shortage. How hypocritical these accusations are, coming from those who welcomed and supported the imperialist war, or who entered into an "agreement" with Kerensky who continued this war! It is this imperialist war that is the cause of all these misfortunes. The revolution engendered by the war cannot avoid the terrible difficulties and suffering bequeathed it by the prolonged, ruinous, reactionary slaughter of the nations. To blame us for the "destruction" of industry, or for the "terror", is either hypocrisy or dull-witted pedantry; it reveals an inability to understand the basic conditions of the fierce class struggle, raised to the highest degree of intensity that is called revolution.

Even when "accusers" of this type do "recognise" the class struggle, they limit themselves to verbal recognition; actually, they constantly slip into the philistine utopia of class "agreement" and "collaboration"; for in revolutionary epochs the class struggle has always, inevitably, and in every country, assumed the form of *civil war*, and civil war is inconceivable without the severest destruction, terror and the restriction of formal democracy in the interests of this war. Only unctuous parsons—whether Christian or "secular" in the persons of parlour, parliamentary socialists—cannot see, understand and feel this necessity. Only a lifeless "man in the muffler"

can shun the revolution for this reason instead of plunging into battle with the utmost ardour and determination at a time when history demands that the greatest problems of humanity be solved by struggle and war.

The American people have a revolutionary tradition which has been adopted by the best representatives of the American proletariat, who have repeatedly expressed their complete solidarity with us Bolsheviks. That tradition is the war of liberation against the British in the eighteenth century and the Civil War in the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ In some respects, if we only take into consideration the "destruction" of some branches of industry and of the national economy, America in 1870 was *behind* 1860. But what a pedant, what an idiot would anyone be to deny on *these* grounds the immense, world-historic, progressive and revolutionary significance of the American Civil War of 1863-65!

The representatives of the bourgeoisie understand that for the sake of overthrowing Negro slavery, of overthrowing the rule of the slave-owners, it was worth letting the country go through long years of civil war, through the abysmal ruin, destruction and terror that accompany every war. But now, when we are confronted with the vastly greater task of overthrowing capitalist *wage-slavery*, of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie—now, the representatives and defenders of the bourgeoisie, and also the reformist socialists who have been frightened by the bourgeoisie and are shunning the revolution, cannot and do not want to understand that civil war is necessary and legitimate.

The American workers will not follow the bourgeoisie. They will be with us, for civil war against the bourgeoisie. The whole history of the world and of the American labour movement strengthens my conviction that this is so. I also recall the words of one of the most beloved leaders of the American proletariat, Eugene Debs, who wrote in the *Appeal to Reason*,⁶⁶ I believe towards the end of 1915, in the article "What Shall I Fight For" (I quoted this article at the beginning of 1916 at a public meeting of workers in Berne, Switzerland)—that he, Debs, would rather be shot than vote credits for the present criminal and reactionary war; that he, Debs, knows of only one holy and, from the proletarian standpoint, legitimate war, namely: the war against the capitalists, the war to liberate mankind from wage-slavery.

I am not surprised that Wilson, the head of the American multimillionaires and servant of the capitalist sharks, has

thrown Debs into prison. Let the bourgeoisie be brutal to the true internationalists, to the true representatives of the revolutionary proletariat! The more fierce and brutal they are, the nearer the day of the victorious proletarian revolution.

We are blamed for the destruction caused by our revolution.... Who are the accusers? The hangers-on of the bourgeoisie, of that very bourgeoisie who, during the four years of the imperialist war, have destroyed almost the whole of European culture and have reduced Europe to barbarism, brutality and starvation. These bourgeoisie now demand we should not make a revolution on these ruins, amidst this wreckage of culture, amidst the wreckage and ruins created by the war, nor with the people who have been brutalised by the war. How humane and righteous the bourgeoisie are!

Their servants accuse us of resorting to terror.... The British bourgeoisie have forgotten their 1649, the French bourgeoisie have forgotten their 1793. Terror was just and legitimate when the bourgeoisie resorted to it for their own benefit against feudalism. Terror became monstrous and criminal when the workers and poor peasants dared to use it against the bourgeoisie! Terror was just and legitimate when used for the purpose of substituting one exploiting minority for another exploiting minority. Terror became monstrous and criminal when it began to be used for the purpose of overthrowing *every* exploiting minority, to be used in the interests of the vast actual majority, in the interests of the proletariat and semi-proletariat, the working class and the poor peasants!

The international imperialist bourgeoisie have slaughtered ten million men and maimed twenty million in "their" war, the war to decide whether the British or the German vultures are to rule the world.

If *our* war, the war of the oppressed and exploited against the oppressors and the exploiters, results in half a million or a million casualties in all countries, the bourgeoisie will say that the former casualties are justified, while the latter are criminal.

The proletariat will have something entirely different to say.

Now, amidst the horrors of the imperialist war, the proletariat is receiving a most vivid and striking illustration of the great truth taught by all revolutions and bequeathed to the workers by their best teachers, the founders of modern socialism. This truth is that no revolution can be successful

unless *the resistance of the exploiters is crushed*. When we, the workers and toiling peasants, captured state power, it became our duty to crush the resistance of the exploiters. We are proud we have been doing this. We regret we are not doing it with sufficient firmness and determination.

Written on August 20, 1918

Vol. 28, pp. 61-70

From *Speech in Polytechnical Museum*
August 23, 1918

(*Stormy applause.*) What is the essence of our programme? Winning socialism. There is no way out of the world war at this moment except by the victory of socialism. But many do not realise this. Most people all over the world now oppose this bloody slaughter, but they cannot see its direct connection with the capitalist system. The horrors of this war are obvious even to the bourgeoisie, but you cannot expect them to associate the end of the war with the end of capitalism.... This, however, is the fundamental idea which has always distinguished the Bolsheviks, and the revolutionary socialists of all other countries, from those who would like to bring peace on earth while leaving the capitalist system intact.

What are wars fought for? We know the majority of wars were fought in the interests of dynasties, and were called dynastic wars. But some wars were fought in the interests of the oppressed. Spartacus set off a war in defence of the enslaved class. Wars of this nature were waged in the period of colonial oppression continuing to this day, in the period of slavery, etc. These wars were just wars and must not be condemned.

But when we talk about the present European war and condemn it, we do so only because it is being waged by the oppressor class.

What is the aim of the present war? If we are to believe the diplomats of all countries, it is being fought by France and Britain to defend the small nations from the barbarians, the German Huns. Germany, for her part, is fighting the Cossack⁶⁷ barbarians who are menacing the civilised German people, and is defending the fatherland from the enemy attack.

But we know this war was carefully prepared, it matured and became inevitable. It was just as inevitable as war is between America and Japan. Why?

Because capitalism has concentrated the earth's wealth in the hands of a few states and divided the world up to the last little bit. Any further division, any further enrichment could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another. The issue could only be settled by force—and, accordingly, war between the world marauders became inevitable.

This war has up to now been headed by two principal firms—Britain and Germany. Britain was the strongest of the colonialist countries. Although her population is not more than 40,000,000, that of her colonies exceeds 400,000,000. Long ago she took by force the colonies of others; she seized vast territories and exploited them. But economically she fell behind Germany during the last fifty years. German industry overhauled British industry. Germany's large-scale state capitalism combined with the bureaucracy—and Germany beat all records.

The rivalry for supremacy between these two giants could only be settled by force.

There was a time when Britain, by dint of her might, seized territory from Holland, Portugal and other countries. Then Germany appeared on the scene and declared that it was now her turn to enrich herself at the expense of others.

That is the root of the matter—the struggle between the strongest powers for the division of the world. And as both sides possess hundreds of millions of capital, their struggle has become world-wide.

We know how many secret crimes have been committed in connection with this war. The secret treaties we have published show that the lofty reasons given for the war are just a lot of empty talk, and that, just like Russia, all the states were involved in sordid treaties for getting rich at the expense of small and weak nations. The result was that those who were strong grew richer still, while those who were weak were crushed.

Individuals cannot be blamed for starting the war; it would be wrong to blame kings and tsars for having brought about this holocaust—it was brought about by capital. Capitalism has turned into a blind alley. This blind alley is imperialism, which dictated war among the rivals for world supremacy.

The claim that the war is being waged for the liberation of small nations is a monstrous lie. Both sets of marauders continue to stand glaring bloodthirstily at each other, while about them many a small nation lie crushed.

And we say there is no way out of the imperialist holocaust except by civil war.

When we said this in 1914 we were told it was like a straight line extending into space; but our analysis has been corroborated by the whole subsequent course of events. Today we find chauvinism's generals being left without an army. In France, which suffered most from the war and was most responsive to the call to defend the fatherland—for the enemy stood at the gates of Paris—the defence advocates have recently suffered a fiasco. True enough, it was at the hands of people like Longuet, who do not know whether they are coming or going, but that is not important.

We know that in the early days of the revolution in Russia power fell into the hands of people who spouted all sorts of words but kept the old tsarist treaties in their pockets. And if in Russia parties veered to the left more rapidly, this was due to the accursed regime that existed before the revolution and to our Revolution of 1905.

In Europe, though, where a shrewd and calculating capitalism rules, where it possesses a powerful and well-knit organisation, the fumes of nationalism are wearing off more slowly. Nevertheless, we can unmistakably see that the imperialist war is dying a slow and painful death.

Vol. 28, pp. 78-80

*Speech at a Meeting
in the Alexeyev People's House
August 23, 1918*

Brief Newspaper Report

(Comrade Lenin's appearance is greeted with stormy, prolonged applause. Comrades, today our Party is arranging meetings to explain what we Communists are fighting for.

The most concise answer to this question would be that we are fighting for the termination of the imperialist war and for socialism.

Right at the very outbreak of the war, when reaction and tsarism held sway, we called the war criminal and said that the only way out was to convert it from imperialist into civil war.

In those days many were uncertain about the connection between the imperialist war and socialism; even many social-

ists thought that this war, like any other, would end by the conclusion of peace.

But four years of war have taught people a lot. It is now becoming clearer and clearer that there is no other way out. The Russian revolution is being followed by the growth of revolution in all the belligerent countries. Why is this so? To answer that question we must explain the attitude of Communists towards war, give our appraisal of it. We regard all wars which are the result of the rapacious ambitions of kings and capitalists as criminal, because they are fatal to the labouring classes and bring rich spoils to the ruling bourgeoisie.

But there are some wars which the working class must regard as the only just wars. These are wars for emancipation from slavery, from capitalist oppression. And such wars are bound to occur, for we cannot secure our emancipation without struggle.

When the war broke out in 1914 between the Germans on the one hand and the British and French on the other to determine how they were to divide up the earth among themselves, who was to have the right to oppress the whole world, the capitalists of both camps tried to disguise their predatory aims by talking about "national defence"; that is how they tried to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

Millions of people have been killed and millions crippled in this war. It has become world-wide. And more and more insistently people are asking what is the purpose of these unnecessary sacrifices.

Britain and Germany are drenched in blood, yet there is no way out of the war; even if some of the imperialist countries were to stop fighting, others would continue.

The capitalists have overreached themselves, they have grabbed more than they can hold. Meanwhile, the armies are becoming demoralised; there are deserters everywhere. The mountains of Italy are swarming with them; in France soldiers are refusing to fight, and even in Germany the old discipline has fallen apart.

French and German soldiers are beginning to realise they must reverse their front and turn their guns against their own governments, as it is impossible to end this bloody war under the capitalist system. Hence the realisation that the workers of the world must take up the struggle against the capitalists of the world.

It is no easy matter to create a socialist system. The Civil War is bound to continue for many a long month, perhaps

for many a long year. This should be clear to a Russian, for he knows how difficult it is to overthrow the ruling class and what desperate resistance the Russian landowners and capitalists are putting up.

There is no country in Europe in which the workers are not in sympathy with the Bolsheviks and are not convinced that the time will come when they will overthrow their own government, just as the Russian workers have overthrown theirs.

We Russian Communists so far stand alone, because our detachment has proved to be ahead of all the others. We have been cut off from our comrades; but we had to act first because our country was the most backward. Our revolution was begun as a general revolution, and we shall tackle our tasks with the help of the workers and peasants of the world.

Our tasks are hard and difficult; many undesirable and pernicious elements are joining our ranks. But the work has begun, and even if we do make mistakes, we should remember that every mistake is an education and a lesson.

Capitalism is an international force, and it can therefore be completely destroyed only through victory in all countries, not in one alone. The war against the Czechs is a war against the capitalists of the whole world.

The workers are rising and joining this struggle; the Petrograd and Moscow workers are joining the army and bringing with them the idea of fighting for the victory of socialism.

The workers will ensure the victory of the Soviet Republic over the Czechs and give it a chance to hold out until the world socialist revolution breaks out. (*Comrade Lenin concludes his speech amidst stormy applause.*)

Vol. 28, pp. 75-77

*From Report at a Joint Session
of the All-Russia Central Executive
Committee, the Moscow Soviet, Factory
Committees and Trade Unions
October 22, 1918*

We can now say that the workers of the world have awoken and are making immense strides; but this makes our position all the more difficult, for our "ally" of yesterday is attacking

us as his chief enemy. He is now out to fight international Bolshevism, not hostile armies. Now that Krasnov's troops are mustering on the Southern Front (and we know they have received ammunition from the Germans), now that we have exposed imperialism in the eyes of the world, the people who blamed us for the Brest-Litovsk Peace and sent Krasnov to get ammunition from the Germans with which to bombard the Russian workers and peasants, are currently getting ammunition from the British and French imperialists, auctioning off Russia to the highest millionaire bidder. That is why our general conviction that a change has set in is now not enough. We have our old enemies, and behind them new forces are now rallying to their aid. We know and see all that. Six months ago, in February or March, we had no army. The army could not fight. The army which had been through four years of imperialist war, without knowing what it was fighting for, but vaguely feeling that it was fighting in the interests of others, that army took to its heels, and no force on earth could stop it.

No revolution is worth anything unless it can defend itself; but a revolution does not learn to defend itself at once. The revolution has awakened millions to a new life. In February and March these millions did not know why they were being sent to continue the slaughter to which the tsars and the Kerenskys had driven them, and whose aim was exposed by the Bolshevik Government only in December. All they knew was that it was not their war, and nearly six months were required before a turn in the tide. This turn has now come; it is changing the force of the revolution. In February and March, the people, exhausted and tormented by four years of war, abandoned everything and said there must be peace and the war terminated. They were in no state to ask what the war was about. If these people have now created a new discipline in the Red Army, not the discipline of the rod and of the landowner but the discipline of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies; if they are now ready to make the greatest sacrifices; if a new unity has sprung up among them, it is because for the first time a new discipline, a socialist discipline, has been born in the minds and experience of tens of millions, a Red Army has been born. It was born only when these tens of millions of people saw from their own experience that they had overthrown the landowners and capitalists, that a new life was being built, that they had begun to build it themselves, and that they would get it built if they were not prevented by foreign invasion.

When the peasants saw who their chief enemy was and began the struggle against the village kulaks, when the workers overthrew the manufacturers and began to organise the factories in accordance with a proletarian principle of national economy, they saw all the difficulty this work of reorganisation entailed, but they proved equal to the task. It took months to get things going. These months have passed, and the turn has come. Gone is the time when we were impotent. We have begun to advance with giant strides. Gone is the time when we had no army and no discipline; a new discipline has been created, and new people are joining the army and laying down their lives by the thousand.

That means that the new discipline, the comradely alliance, has re-educated us in the struggle at the front and in the struggle in the countryside against the kulak. This turning-point has been a difficult one, but now we feel that things are beginning to move, and that we are passing from unorganised, decree-made socialism to true socialism. The chief task facing us is to fight imperialism, and this fight we must win. We make no secret of all the difficulty and danger this fight entails. We know that the tide of feeling has changed in the Red Army; it has begun to win victories, it is promoting from its ranks thousands of officers who have been through training courses in the new proletarian military colleges and thousands of other officers who have been through no other training than the hard training of war. Thus, without the least exaggeration, and fully recognising the danger, we can now say that we have an army; and this army has created discipline and has achieved fighting efficiency. Our Southern Front is not just a front—it is a front against British and French imperialism, against the most powerful foe in the world. But we are not afraid, for we know the foe will be unable to cope with its own enemy at home.

Three months ago, people used to laugh when we said there might be a revolution in Germany. They said that only half-crazy Bolsheviks could believe in a German revolution. Not only the entire bourgeoisie, but the Mensheviks and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries as well, called the Bolsheviks traitors to patriotism and said that revolution in Germany was impossible. But we knew that our help was needed there, and that to render that help we had to sacrifice everything and consent even to the most onerous terms of peace. That was how these people were talking and trying to prove their point to us only a few months ago, but in these few months Germany, from a mighty empire, has become a rotten hulk. The force which

has corroded it is operating in America and England as well; today it is weak, but with every step the British and French try to take in Russia, with every step they try to take to occupy the Ukraine, as the Germans did, this force will loom larger and larger and become even more formidable than the Spanish 'flu....

Vol. 28, pp. 122-25

From *Report of the Central Committee*
March 18

Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)
March 18-23, 1919

We have always said that there are different kinds of wars. We condemned the *imperialist* war, but we did not reject *war in general*. Those who accused us of being militarists were hopelessly muddled. And when in the report of the Berne Conference⁶⁸ of yellow socialists I read that Kautsky had said that the Bolsheviks had introduced not socialism but militarism, I smiled and shrugged my shoulders. As if there was ever a big revolution in history that was not connected with war! Of course not! We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and it is inconceivable for the Soviet Republic to exist alongside of the imperialist states for any length of time. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end comes there will have to be a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states. If the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold power, it must, therefore, prove its ability to do so by its military organisation. How was a class which had hitherto served as cannon-fodder for the military commanders of the ruling imperialist class to create its own commanders? How was it to solve the problem of combining the enthusiasm, the new revolutionary creative spirit of the oppressed and the employment of the store of the bourgeois science and technology of militarism in their worst forms without which this class would not be able to master modern technology and modern methods of warfare?...

Vol. 29, p. 153

From *Deception of the People*
with *Slogans of Freedom and Equality*
May 19, 1919

First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education

...We said that emergence from this war may involve us in a revolutionary war. We said this from 1915 onwards, and then later, in the Kerensky period. Of course, revolutionary war is also war, just as arduous, sanguinary and painful. And when the revolution develops on a world scale it inevitably arouses resistance on the same world scale. The situation now being such that all the civilised countries in the world are fighting against Russia, we must not be surprised that extremely ignorant peasants are accusing us of failing to keep our promises. Nothing else is to be expected from them. In view of their absolute ignorance, we cannot blame them. Indeed, how can you expect a very ignorant peasant to understand that there are different kinds of wars, that there are just and unjust wars, progressive and reactionary wars, wars waged by advanced classes and wars waged by backward classes, wars waged for the purpose of perpetuating class oppression and wars waged for the purpose of eliminating oppression? To understand this one must be familiar with the class struggle, with the principles of socialism, and at least a little bit familiar with the history of revolution. You cannot expect this from an ignorant peasant.

But when a man who calls himself a democrat, or a socialist, gets up on a platform to make a public statement — irrespective of what he calls himself, Menshevik, Social-Democrat, Socialist-Revolutionary, true socialist, adherent of the Berne International, there are lots of titles of this sort, titles are cheap — when such an individual gets up and charges us with having promised peace and called forth war, what answer should be made to him? Are we to assume that he is as ignorant as the ignorant peasant who cannot distinguish one kind of war from another? Are we to assume that he does not see the difference between the imperialist war, which was a predatory war, and which has now been utterly exposed as such — since the Treaty of Versailles only those who are totally incapable of reasoning and thinking, or who are totally blind, can fail to see that it was a predatory war on both sides — are we to assume that there is even one literate person who fails to see the difference between that predatory war and the

war we are waging and which is assuming world-wide dimensions, because the world bourgeoisie have realised that they must fight their last decisive battle? We cannot assume any of this. And that is why we say that anybody who claims to be a democrat, or a socialist, of whatever shade, is a supporter of the bourgeoisie if he in one way or another, directly or indirectly, spreads among the people the accusation that the Bolsheviks are dragging out the Civil War, which is an arduous and painful war, whereas they promised peace; and this is how we shall answer him, and we shall take our stand against him just as we do against Kolchak. Such is our answer. Such is the entire issue.

The gentlemen of *Dyelo Naroda* express astonishment and say: "But we are opposed to Kolchak; what terrible injustice to persecute us!"

It is a great pity, gentlemen, that you refuse to be logical and do not wish to understand the simple ABC of politics from which certain definite deductions must be made. You say that you are opposed to Kolchak. I take up the newspapers *Vsegda Vpered!* and *Dyelo Naroda* and read the philistine arguments of this type, these moods that are so numerous and that prevail among the intelligentsia. I say that every one of you who spreads such accusations among the people is supporting Kolchak, because he does not understand the elementary, fundamental difference, which every literate person sees, between the imperialist war which we smashed, and the Civil War in which we have become involved. We never concealed from the people the fact that we were taking this risk. We are straining every nerve to defeat the bourgeoisie in this Civil War and to prevent all possibility of class oppression. There has never been, nor can there ever be, a revolution that was guaranteed against a long and arduous struggle, and perhaps filled with the most desperate sacrifices. Those who are unable to distinguish between the sacrifices made in the course of a revolutionary struggle for the sake of its victory, when all the propertied, all the counter-revolutionary classes are fighting against the revolution, those who cannot distinguish between these sacrifices and the sacrifices involved in a predatory war waged by the exploiters, are either abysmally ignorant—and such people ought to be made to learn their ABC, before giving them adult education they ought to be given the most elementary education—or they are out-and-out Kolchak-supporting hypocrites, whatever they may call themselves, or under whichever title they may try to disguise

themselves. And these accusations against the Bolsheviks are the most common and widespread. They are really linked up with the broad masses of the working people, because the ignorant peasants find it difficult to understand; they suffer from all war, no matter what the war is about. I am not surprised when I hear an ignorant peasant say: "We had to fight for the tsar, we fought for the Mensheviks, and now we have to fight for the Bolsheviks." This does not surprise me. Indeed, war is war, and entails endless heavy sacrifices. "The tsar said that it was a war for freedom and liberation from a yoke; the Mensheviks said that it was a war for freedom and liberation from a yoke. And now the Bolsheviks say the same thing. They all say the same thing; how can we sort this all out?"

Indeed, how can an ignorant peasant sort it all out? Such a man still has to learn elementary politics. But what can we say about a man who uses such words as "revolution", "democracy", and "socialism", and claims that these words should be used with understanding. He cannot juggle with such words unless he wants to be a political faker, for the difference between a war between two groups of robbers and a war waged by an oppressed class which has risen in revolt against all robbery is an elementary, radical and fundamental difference. The issue is not one of a certain party, class or government justifying war—the real point at issue is the nature of the war, its class content, which class is waging it, and what policy is embodied in it....

Vol. 29, pp. 343-45

*In Reply to Questions
Put by Karl Wiegand,
Berlin Correspondent
of Universal Service*

1. Do we intend to attack Poland and Rumania?

No. We have declared most emphatically and officially, in the name of the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, our peaceful intentions. It is very much to be regretted that the French capitalist government is instigating Poland (and presumably Rumania, too) to attack us. This is even mentioned by a number of American radios from Lyons.

2. What are our plans in Asia?

They are the same as in Europe: peaceful coexistence with all peoples; with the workers and peasants of all nations awakening to a new life—a life without exploiters, without landowners, without capitalists, without merchants. The imperialist war of 1914-18, the war of the capitalists of the Anglo-French (and Russian) group against the German-Austrian capitalist group for the partition of the world, has awakened Asia and has strengthened there, as everywhere else, the urge towards freedom, towards peaceful labour and against possible future wars.

3. What would be the basis of peace with America?

Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We shall not touch them. We are even ready to pay them in gold for any machinery, tools, etc., useful to our transport and industries. We are ready to pay not only in gold, but in raw materials too.

4. What are the obstacles to such a peace?

None on our part; imperialism on the part of the American (and of any other) capitalists.

5. What are our views of the deportation of Russian revolutionaries from America?

We have accepted them. We are not afraid of revolutionaries here in this country. As a matter of fact, we are not afraid of anybody, and if America is afraid of a few more hundred or thousand of its citizens, we are ready to begin negotiations with a view of receiving any citizens whom America thinks dangerous (with the exception of criminals, of course).

6. What possibilities are there of an economic alliance between Russia and Germany?

Unfortunately, they are not great. The Scheidemanns are bad allies. We stand for an alliance with all countries without exception.

7. What are our views upon the allied demand for the extradition of war criminals?

If we are to speak seriously on this matter of war guilt, the guilty ones are the capitalists of all countries. Hand over to us all your landed proprietors owning more than a hundred hectares and capitalists having a capital of more than 100,000 francs, and we shall educate them to useful labour and make

them break with the shameful, base and bloody role of exploiters and instigators of wars for the partition of colonies. Wars will then soon become absolutely impossible.

8. What would be the influence of peace with Russia upon the economic conditions in Europe?

Exchange of machinery for grain, flax and other raw materials—I ask, can this be disadvantageous for Europe? Clearly, it cannot be anything but beneficial.

9. What is our opinion regarding the future development of the Soviets as a world force?

The future belongs to the Soviet system all the world over. The facts have proved it. One has only to count by quarterly periods, say, the growth in the number of pamphlets, books, leaflets and newspapers standing for or sympathising with the Soviets published in any country. It cannot be otherwise. Once the workers in the cities, the workers, landless peasants and the handicraftsmen in the villages as well as the small peasants (i.e., those who do not exploit hired labour)—once this enormous majority of working people have understood that the Soviet system gives all power into their hands, releasing them from the yoke of landlords and capitalists—how could one prevent the victory of the Soviet system all over the world? I, for one, do not know of any means of preventing it.

10. Has Russia still to fear counter-revolution from without?

Unfortunately, it has, for the capitalists are stupid, greedy people. They have made a number of such stupid, greedy attempts at intervention and one has to fear repetitions until the workers and peasants of all countries thoroughly *re-educate* their own capitalists.

11. Is Russia ready to enter into business relations with America?

Of course she is ready to do so, and with all other countries. Peace with Estonia, to whom we have conceded a great deal, has proved our readiness, for the sake of business relations, to give even industrial concessions on certain conditions.

February 18, 1920

V. Ulyanov (N. Lenin)

Published on February 21, 1920
in the *New York Evening Journal*
No. 12671

Vol. 30, pp. 365-67

From *Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution*

...The question of imperialist wars, of the international policy of finance capital which now dominates the whole world, a policy that must *inevitably* engender new imperialist wars, that must inevitably cause an extreme intensification of national oppression, pillage, brigandry and the strangulation of weak, backward and small nationalities by a handful of "advanced" powers—that question has been the keystone of all policy in all the countries of the globe since 1914. It is a question of life and death for millions upon millions of people. It is a question of whether 20,000,000 people (as compared with the 10,000,000 who were killed in the war of 1914-18 and in the supplementary "minor" wars that are still going on) are to be slaughtered in the next imperialist war, which the bourgeoisie are preparing, and which is growing out of capitalism before our very eyes. It is a question of whether in that future war, which is inevitable (if capitalism continues to exist), 60,000,000 people are to be maimed (compared with the 30,000,000 maimed in 1914-18). In this question, too, our October Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in world history. The lackeys of the bourgeoisie and its yes-men—the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, and the petty-bourgeois, allegedly "socialist", democrats all over the world—derided our slogan "convert the imperialist war into a civil war". But that slogan proved to be the *truth*—it was the only truth, unpleasant, blunt, naked and brutal, but nevertheless the *truth*, as against the host of most refined jingoist and pacifist lies. Those lies are being dispelled. The Brest peace has been exposed. And with every passing day the significance and consequences of a peace that is even worse than the Brest peace—the peace of Versailles—are being more relentlessly exposed. And the millions who are thinking about the causes of the recent war and of the approaching future war are more and more clearly realising the grim and inexorable truth that it is impossible to escape imperialist war, and imperialist peace (if the old orthography were still in use, I would have written the word *mir* in two ways, to give it both its meanings)* which inevitably engen-

* In Russian, the word *mir* has two meanings (*world* and *peace*) and had two different spellings in the old orthography.—*Tr.*

ders imperialist war, that it is impossible to escape that inferno, *except by a Bolshevik struggle and a Bolshevik revolution.*

Let the bourgeoisie and the pacifists, the generals and the petty bourgeoisie, the capitalists and the philistines, the pious Christians and the knights of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals⁶⁹ vent their fury against that revolution. No torrents of abuse, calumnies and lies can enable them to conceal the historic fact that for the first time in hundreds and thousands of years the slaves have replied to a war between slave-owners by openly proclaiming the slogan: "Convert this war between slave-owners for the division of their loot into a war of the slaves of all nations against the slave-owners of all nations."

For the first time in hundreds and thousands of years that slogan has grown from a vague and helpless waiting into a clear and definite political programme, into an effective struggle waged by millions of oppressed people under the leadership of the proletariat; it has grown into the first victory of the proletariat, the first victory in the struggle to abolish war and to unite the workers of all countries against the united bourgeoisie of different nations, against the bourgeoisie that makes peace and war at the expense of the slaves of capital, the wage-workers, the peasants, the working people.

This first victory is *not yet the final victory*, and it was achieved by our October Revolution at the price of incredible difficulties and hardships, at the price of unprecedented suffering, accompanied by a series of serious reverses and mistakes on our part. How could a single backward people be expected to frustrate the imperialist wars of the most powerful and most developed countries of the world without sustaining reverses and without committing mistakes! We are not afraid to admit our mistakes and shall examine them dispassionately in order to learn how to correct them. But the fact remains that for the first time in hundreds and thousands of years the promise "to reply" to war between the slave-owners by a revolution of the slaves directed *against* all the slave-owners *has been completely fulfilled*—and is being fulfilled despite all difficulties.

We have made the start. When, at what date and time, and the proletarians of which nation will complete this process is not important. The important thing is that the ice has been broken; the road is open, the way has been shown.

Gentlemen, capitalists of all countries, keep up your hypocritical pretence of "defending the fatherland"—the Japanese

fatherland against the American, the American against the Japanese, the French against the British, and so forth! Gentlemen, knights of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, pacifist petty bourgeoisie and philistines of the entire world, go on "evading" the question of how to combat imperialist wars by issuing new "Basle Manifestos" (on the model of the Basle Manifesto of 1912). *The first Bolshevik revolution* has wrested *the first hundred million people* of this earth from the clutches of imperialist war and the imperialist world. Subsequent revolutions will deliver the rest of mankind from such wars and from such a world....

Pravda, No. 234,
October 18, 1921

Vol. 33, pp. 55-57

From *The Theses
on the Agrarian Question
Adopted by the Communist Party
of France*

Being in complete agreement with these main ideas in the theses, I can only make the following few general observations about them.

1. The first part of the theses deals with the question: "war or revolution?" Here it says among other things, and quite rightly, that "the events of the last few years have killed the pacifist and Wilson ideology" ("les événements des dernières années ont tué l'idéologie pacifiste et wilsonienne").

In order to dispel these pacifist illusions completely I think we should speak not only of war in general, but also of the specifically imperialist nature of the war of 1914-18, and of the war now in preparation between America and Japan with the probable participation of Great Britain and France.

There is no doubt that only the proletarian revolution can and certainly will put a stop to all war. But it would be a pacifist illusion to think that a victorious proletarian revolution in one country, say France, could put a stop to all war once and for all.

The experience of Russia has vividly dispelled this illusion. This experience has shown that only by means of a revolution were we able to extricate ourselves from the imperialist war, and that the Russian workers and peasants have gained immensely by their revolution *despite* the *Civil War* forced

upon them by the capitalists of all countries. Just as reactionary wars, and imperialist wars in particular, are criminal and fatal (and among imperialist wars must be included the war France waged in 1914-18; the Treaty of Versailles has very vividly demonstrated this), so revolutionary wars are legitimate and just—i.e., wars waged against the capitalists in defence of the oppressed classes, wars against the oppressors in defence of the nations oppressed by the imperialists of a handful of countries, wars in defence of the socialist revolution against foreign invaders. The more clearly the masses of workers and peasants of France understand this the less probable and less prolonged will be the inevitable attempts of the French, British and other capitalists to crush the revolution of the workers and peasants of France by means of war. In present-day Europe, after the victory Soviet Russia has achieved over *all* the capitalist countries which supported Denikin, Kolchak, Wrangel, Yudenich and Pilsudski—in present-day Europe, in view of the outrageous and shameless throttling of Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, a civil war waged by the French capitalists against a victorious socialist revolution in France can only be of very short duration and a thousand times less arduous for the French workers and peasants than the Civil War was for the Russians. Nevertheless, it is absolutely necessary to distinguish clearly between imperialist wars—wars for the division of capitalist loot, wars to strangle small and weak nations—and revolutionary wars—wars of defence against the counter-revolutionary capitalists, wars to throw off the capitalist yoke.

In the light of the foregoing considerations I think that instead of what is said in the theses about “war or revolution”, it would be more correct to say approximately the following.

The events of the last few years have revealed the utter falsity and fraud of the pacifist and Wilson ideology. This fraud must be thoroughly exposed. The war of 1914-18 was an imperialist, predatory and reactionary war not only on the part of Germany, but also on the part of France. This has been most vividly demonstrated by the Treaty of Versailles, which is even more brutal and revolting than the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The new war now in preparation between America and Japan (or Great Britain), and which is unavoidable if capitalism continues to exist, will inevitably involve capitalist France, for she is implicated in all the imperialist crimes, atrocities and villainies of the present imperialist era. Either another war or series of wars to “defend” French

imperialism, or a socialist revolution — there is no other choice before the workers and peasants of France. They will not allow themselves to be intimidated by the tales of the counter-revolutionary capitalists about the hardships of the Civil War which they forced upon Soviet Russia. The workers and peasants of France proved that they were capable of waging a legitimate, just and revolutionary war against their feudal aristocracy when the latter wanted to crush the great French Revolution of the eighteenth century. They will be able to wage a similarly legitimate, just and revolutionary war against the French capitalists, when the latter become émigrés and organise foreign invasion against the French Socialist Republic. It will be easier for the French workers and peasants to crush their exploiters because the *whole* of Europe, exhausted, tormented and Balkanised by the atrocious Treaty of Versailles, will, directly or indirectly, be on their side....

Written on December 11, 1921

Vol. 33, pp. 132-34

*From Political Report
of the Central Committee of
the R.C.P.(B.)*

March 27, 1922

Eleventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)

...War is now in the air. The trade unions, for example, the reformist trade unions, are passing resolutions against war and are threatening to call strikes in opposition to war. Recently, if I am not mistaken, I read a report in the newspapers to the effect that a certain very good Communist delivered an anti-war speech in the French Chamber of Deputies in the course of which he stated that the workers would prefer to rise in revolt rather than go to war. This question cannot be formulated in the way we formulated it in 1912, when the Basle Manifesto was issued. The Russian revolution alone has shown how it is possible to emerge from war, and what effort this entails. It showed what emerging from a reactionary war by revolutionary methods means. Reactionary imperialist wars are inevitable in all parts of the world; and in solving problems of this sort mankind cannot and will not forget that tens of millions were slaughtered then, and will be slaugh-

tered again if war breaks out. We are living in the twentieth century, and the only nation that emerged from a reactionary war by revolutionary methods not for the benefit of a particular government, but by overthrowing it, was the Russian nation, and it was the Russian revolution that extricated it. What has been won by the Russian revolution is irrevocable. No power on earth can erase that; nor can any power on earth erase the fact that the Soviet state has been created. This is a historic victory.

Vol. 33, pp. 300-01

Notes

¹ The 1904-05 war between Russia and Japan was for supremacy in the Far East. Tsarist Russia was poorly prepared for the war and was defeated. Port Arthur fell on December 20, 1904. p. 9

² *Revolutionnaya Rossiya* (Revolutionary Russia)—illegal newspaper published by the Socialist-Revolutionaries (see Note 4) from 1900 to 1905. p. 9

³ *Free Trade*—a trend in bourgeois economic policy demanding freedom of trade and non-interference by the state in private economic activities. *Protectionism*—a system of economic measures for developing the capitalist industry or agriculture of a given country and for protecting them from foreign competition.

⁴ *Socialist-Revolutionaries* (S.R.s)—members of petty-bourgeois party active in Russia from 1901 to 1923. The S.R.s did not recognise the class differences between the proletariat and the peasantry and rejected the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. The tactics of individual terrorism advocated by the Socialist-Revolutionaries as the main form of struggle against the autocracy harmed the revolutionary movement considerably.

After the triumph of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in 1917, the S.R.s, Mensheviks and Cadets (see Notes 45 and 46) were the mainstay of the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government of the bourgeoisie and landowners. Several Socialist-Revolutionary leaders held portfolios in this government.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Socialist-Revolutionaries fought against Soviet power. p. 10

⁵ *Iskra* (The Spark)—the first all-Russia illegal Marxist newspaper, founded by Lenin abroad in December 1900, and brought secretly into Russia. At the Second Congress of the RSDLP, in 1903, the party split into a revolutionary wing, headed by Lenin and taking the name Bolsheviks, and an opportunist wing, Mensheviks. The latter seized control of the newspaper and, from its 52nd issue onwards, *Iskra* was referred to as the *new Iskra* to distinguish it from the Leninist *old* one. The new *Iskra* ceased

to be a combat organ of revolutionary Marxism. The Mensheviks used it as an instrument to fight Marxism and the Bolshevik Party and turned it into the platform for preaching opportunism. The new *Iskra* was published till October 1905.

p. 10

⁶ On January 9, 1905, a peaceful workers' march to the Winter Palace (the residence of the Russian tsars) to hand the Tsar a petition was shot at by order of Nicholas II. Over 1,000 people were killed and about 5,000 wounded.

January 9, which became known as Bloody Sunday, sparked off the 1905 Revolution.

p. 11

⁷ The *Stuttgart International Socialist Congress* was held from August 18 to 24, 1907.

p. 13

⁸ *Die Neue Zeit* (New Times)—a theoretical journal of the German Social-Democratic Party, published in Stuttgart from 1883 to 1923.

p. 14

⁹ This was the first document to define the Bolshevik stand on the imperialist world war that broke out in August 1914.

p. 15

¹⁰ *Junkers*—the landowning nobility in Prussia.

p. 15

¹¹ The reference is to the 1870-71 war between France, which aspired to preserve its supremacy in Europe and prevented unification of Germany, and Prussia which fought together with several other German states. The war brought the collapse of the Second Empire in France and completion of Germany's unification under Prussia's supremacy. Until the rout of the French army at Sedan (September 1870), the war was a progressive one on Prussia's part, but once the French Republic had been proclaimed in September 1870, it became a war of conquest. The Franco-Prussian war ended with the predatory Frankfurt peace treaty of 1871, weighed against France.

p. 21

¹² The *Second International*—an international association of socialist parties founded in 1889. When the age of imperialism began, opportunist trends gained the upper hand in it. In 1914, when the world war broke out, the opportunist leaders of the Second International openly championed the imperialist policy pursued by their countries' bourgeois governments. The Second International finally broke up.

p. 25

¹³ *Zhizn* (Life)—a Socialist-Revolutionary paper published in 1915-16 first in Paris and then in Geneva.

p. 26

¹⁴ The *Quadruple Entente*—an imperialist alliance between Britain, France, Russia and Italy; the latter left the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-

Hungary and Italy) and joined the Triple Entente (Entente cordiale).
p. 33

¹⁵ Lenin is referring to the all-Russia October political strike and December armed uprising in 1905, during the first Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905-07.
p.34

¹⁶ *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Social-Democrat)—an illegal newspaper published from 1908 to 1917 as the central organ of the RSDLP. p. 36

¹⁷ *Proudhonism* was a variety of petty-bourgeois socialism based on the views of Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865). Criticising large-scale capitalist production, adherents of Proudhonism sought to perpetuate small commodity production; they ignored political struggle, political parties, strikes and trades unions, and advanced utopian projects for eliminating exploitation through producers', credit and consumers' associations, through barter and the peaceful abolition of the state which, they believed, was the primary cause of social injustice. p. 38

¹⁸ The *Treaty of Brest-Litovsk* between Soviet Russia and the countries of the Quadruple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey) was signed on March 3, 1918 and ratified by the Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets on March 15. The peace terms were extremely onerous for Soviet Russia. In August 1918, Germany imposed on the Soviet Republic a supplementary treaty and financial agreement, which contained increasingly predatory terms.

Though exceedingly onerous, the Brest Treaty allowed Soviet Russia a peaceful respite for demobilising the old, disintegrating army and replacing it with a new, Red Army, for starting to build socialism and mustering her forces for the struggle against internal counter-revolution and foreign intervention. The treaty was a wise political compromise, a graphic example of Lenin's wisdom, the flexibility of his tactics and ability to work out the only correct policy on war and peace in the extremely complex political situation.

After the November 1918 revolution in Germany, which overthrew the monarchy there, on November 13 the All-Russia Central Executive Committee abrogated the Brest Treaty. p. 39

¹⁹ The *Peace Treaty of Versailles*, which concluded the First World War (1914-18), was signed on June 28, 1919 by the USA, the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan and the other Allied Powers, on the one hand, and Germany, on the other.

The treaty consolidated the partition of the capitalist world in favour of the victorious countries and established a system of state relations aimed at strangling Soviet Russia and suppressing the world revolutionary movement. p. 40

²⁰ *Wilsonism*—after Woodrow Wilson, US President from 1913 to 1921. In the first year of his presidency, Wilson enacted several laws (on a pro-

gressive income tax, anti-trust bill and others), which he demagogically called the age of "new freedom".

During his presidency, the USA entered the imperialist world war.

As soon as Soviet power was established, Wilson became one of the first to inspire and organise intervention against Soviet Russia. To counteract the deep impact of the Soviet Government's peaceful policy on the broad population, Wilson advanced his Fourteen Points, a demagogic "peace programme" designed to camouflage the USA's aggressive policy. American propaganda and the European bourgeois press hailed Wilson as a peace fighter. But the hypocritical petty-bourgeois phrase-mongering by Wilson and "Wilsonians" was soon exposed by the reactionary anti-labour policy and the aggressive foreign policy pursued by the USA.

p.40

²¹ On the Basle Manifesto, see this collection, pp. 34-35. p. 40

²² The *International Socialist Committee* — the executive of the Zimmerwald Association, elected at the First International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald from September 5 to 8, 1915. Soon after the conference, an extended International Socialist Committee was set up; it included representatives of all the parties that supported the decisions of the Zimmerwald Conference.

Internationale Sozialistische Kommission zu Bern. Bulletin was the ISC organ, published in German, French and English from 1915 to 1917.

The 3rd issue of the I.S.C. *Bulletin* (February 1916) carried the theses of the *Internationale* group; they defined the position adopted by German Left Social-Democrats on the most urgent theoretical and political problems during the imperialist world war.

p. 40

²³ The *Internationale group* — a revolutionary organisation of German Left Social-Democrats formed at the outbreak of the First World War. Besides political leaflets that it printed in 1915, in 1916 the group began the illegal publication and distribution of "Political Letters", signed Spartacus (hence its second name — the Spartacus group), which appeared regularly until October 1918.

The members of the Spartacus group carried on revolutionary propaganda, organised mass-scale anti-war actions, led strikes and exposed the imperialist nature of the world war and the treachery of the opportunist Social-Democratic leaders.

In April 1917, the Spartacists affiliated with the Centrist Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, but retained their organisational independence. In November 1918, during the revolution in Germany, they broke with the Independents and formed the Spartacus League. At the Inaugural Congress held from December 30, 1918 to January 1, 1919, they founded the Communist Party of Germany.

p. 40

²⁴ The *Seven Years' War* (1756-63) was provoked by the predatory aspirations of the European feudal autocracies and colonial rivalry between France and Britain. Britain, in alliance with Prussia, came out against a coalition formed by Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. As a result of the Seven Years' War, France was forced to cede its largest possessions

(Canada, East Indies, etc) to Britain, while Prussia, Austria and Saxony retained their prewar frontiers. p. 43

²⁵ This refers to the revolutionary war of independence fought by 13 British colonies in North America (1775-83). The protest by the North American colonies against the British domination was a result of the striving of the new American bourgeois nation to win independence and remove the obstacles raised by British colonial rule to the country's capitalist development, so it was bourgeois in character. The North American colonies emerged victorious from the war, and a new, independent bourgeois state—the United States of America—was established. p. 44

²⁶ The *Organising Committee* was the leading body of the opportunist Menshevik wing of the RSDLP. During the First World War, its members took a social-chauvinist stand and justified the war on the part of tsarist Russia. p. 46

²⁷ The *Jacobins*—a political group of the Left-wing bourgeoisie during the French Revolution. They resolutely and consistently advocated the abolition of absolutism and feudalism.

p. 47

²⁸ See Note 5. p. 48

²⁹ The *Prizyv* group was founded by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in September 1915. The group held an extreme social-chauvinist position. p. 46

³⁰ The reference is to the statement of the Norwegian Left Social-Democrats, who agreed in principle with the draft resolution drawn up by Lenin and submitted by Left Social-Democrats to the First International Socialist Conference, in September 1915. The draft condemned the war, exposed the betrayal of social-chauvinists and stressed the need for anti-war actions. The statement was later supported by the Swedish Left Social-Democrats. p. 51

³¹ *Imperialist Economism*—an opportunist trend in the international Socialist Democratic movement at the time of the First World War (1914-18). The Imperialist Economists opposed the right of nations to self-determination and struggle for reforms and democratic transformations. p. 52

³² *Tolstoyans* were followers of the religious ethic teachings of Lev Tolstoy, based on the Christian ideas of not resisting evil with violence. p. 56

³³ *Jugend-Internationale* (Youth International)—the organ of the Inter-

national League of Socialist Youth Organisations published in Zurich
from 1915 to 1918. p. 63

³⁴ Lenin is referring to the theses on the war question drawn up by the Swiss Social-Democrat R. Grimm. p. 63

³⁵ *Neues Leben* (New Life)—a monthly journal of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party published in Berne from 1915 to 1917.
Vorbote (Herald)—the theoretical journal of the Zimmerwald Left (a group founded by Left Social-Democrats at the First International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald). Two issues appeared in 1916. p. 63

³⁶ *L'Humanité*—a daily newspaper founded in 1904 by Jean Jaurès as the organ of the French Socialist Party. During the First World War (1914-18), being controlled by the Right wing of the party, it took a social-chauvinist stand.
Since 1920 *L'Humanité* has been the central organ of the French Communist Party. p. 73

³⁷ The bourgeois-democratic revolution, which overthrew tsarism in Russia, took place from February 23 to 27 (March 8-12), 1917. p. 77

³⁸ *Blancism*—after the French petty-bourgeois socialist Louis Blanc (1811-1882), who renounced irreconcilable class antagonisms under capitalism, opposed proletarian revolution and supported conciliation with the bourgeoisie. p. 80

³⁹ This refers to the bourgeois Provisional Government formed on March 2(15), 1917. p. 81

⁴⁰ *Pravda* (Truth)—a legal Bolshevik daily, founded by Lenin in 1912, the organ of the CPSU Central Committee today. p. 81

⁴¹ *Rech* (Speech)—a daily published in St. Petersburg from 1906 to 1917 as the central organ of the Constitutional-Democratic Party (see Note 46). p. 90

⁴² *Zemlya i Volya* (Land and Freedom)—a Socialist-Revolutionary daily published from April to September 1917. p. 92

⁴³ The *Third French Republic*—the bourgeois republic proclaimed as a result of the September 1870 revolution. It ceased to exist in July 1940. p. 93

⁴⁴ This refers to the petty-bourgeois parties of Socialist-Revolutionaries, Trudoviks and Popular Socialists. p. 94

⁴⁵ The Mensheviks were adherents of the petty-bourgeois opportunist trend in the Russian Social-Democratic movement. They exercised a bourgeois influence on the working class. They got their name at the close of the Second RSDLP Congress (1903) when, during the elections to the Party's central organs, they found themselves in the minority (*menshinstvo*), and the revolutionary Social-Democrats, headed by Lenin, won the majority (*bolshinstvo*); hence the names Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

During the First World War, most Mensheviks adopted a social-chauvinist stand. Following the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in 1917, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries accepted posts in the Provisional Government, supported its imperialist policy and opposed the mounting proletarian revolution.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Mensheviks fought against Soviet power.

p. 94

⁴⁶ Cadets — members of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the principal party of liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie in Russia, active from 1905 to 1917. The Cadets gave their full support to tsarism on the main issues of its home and foreign policy. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, they held portfolios in the bourgeois Provisional Government and called for the imperialist war to be continued.

After the October Revolution, the Cadets fought against Soviet power.

p. 94

⁴⁷ Dyen (Day) — a bourgeois liberal daily published in St. Petersburg from 1912 to 1917.

p. 95

⁴⁸ Milyukov was the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government formed shortly after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Provisional Government represented the big bourgeoisie and landowners.

Tereshchenko was a member of the coalition Provisional Government formed in May 1917. The posts in the government were distributed between ten capitalist and five socialist ministers.

p. 95

⁴⁹ The Civil List — the part of the state budget in constitutional monarchies allocated for the personal expenses of the sovereign and the maintenance of his household.

p. 96

⁵⁰ On October 21, 1916, the Austrian Social-Democrat Friedrich Adler assassinated Count Stürgkh, Austria's Prime Minister, for refusing to reinstate the Imperial Diet dissolved in 1914.

p. 98

⁵¹ This refers to the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma, a representative body in Russia from 1906 to 1917. At the Duma sitting on July 26 (August 8), 1914, when the representatives from all the bourgeois-landowning factions approved of tsarist Russia entering the imperialist war, the Bolshevik deputies lodged a resolute protest against it. They refused to vote for war credits and started revolutionary propaganda among the work-

ing masses. The Bolshevik deputies were arrested in November 1914, brought to trial in February 1915 and exiled for life to Siberia. p. 100

⁵² This refers to Petrograd (now Leningrad) and Moscow. p. 103

⁵³ In September 1917 the *Alexandrinsky Theatre* in Petrograd housed the Session of the Democratic Conference.

The *Peter and Paul Fortress* in Petrograd had a large arsenal and was an important strategic point. Under tsarism political prisoners were kept there. p. 105

⁵⁴ *Officer cadets*—pupils of privileged military schools in tsarist Russia. The *Savage Division* was formed during the First World War (1914-18) and made up of volunteers from among the Caucasian mountaineers. p. 105

⁵⁵ See Note 23. p. 105

⁵⁶ The *Left Socialist-Revolutionaries* formed their own party after splitting from the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in 1917.

They co-operated with the Bolsheviks but disagreed with them on basic issues of building socialism, and opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat. They came out against the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty in 1918. In July 1918 their Central Committee organised the assassination of the German ambassador to Moscow in the hope of provoking war between Soviet Russia and Germany, and started an armed revolt against Soviet power. After the revolt was crushed, the Fifth All-Russia Congress of Soviets passed a decision to expel from the Soviets all Left Socialist-Revolutionaries who shared the views of their leaders. The party ceased to exist in 1921. p. 109

⁵⁷ The “*Left Communists*”—an anti-party group formed early in 1918 in connection with the signing of a peace treaty with Germany (the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk). Hiding behind Left phrases about a revolutionary war, the “*Left Communists*” urged an adventuristic policy of drawing the Soviet Republic, which did not yet have an army, into a war against imperialist Germany and thereby threatened the very existence of Soviet power. Lenin and his supporters had to wage a persistent struggle in the Central Committee against Trotsky and the “*Left Communists*” to secure a decision on the signing of the peace treaty with Germany and save the young Soviet Republic. p. 113

⁵⁸ The *Thirty Years' War of 1618-48*—a general European war caused by the struggle between Protestants and Catholics. Germany became the main arena of the struggle, a target for plunder and predatory claims. The war ended with the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, which legalised the political dismemberment of Germany. p. 114

⁵⁹ The *Novaya Zhizn* (New Life) group included the Internationalist Mensheviks, who were a small wing of the Menshevik Party advocating inconsistent internationalist, Centrist, views during the First World War and rallied around the newspaper of the same name.

Novaya Zhizn (New Life)—a daily published in Petrograd from April to July 1918. It was hostile to the Great October Socialist Revolution and Soviet power. p. 116

⁶⁰ *The man in the muffler*—the title character in A. P. Chekhov's story; a narrow-minded philistine, scared of everything new and any display of initiative. p. 117

⁶¹ *Vpered* (Forward)—a Menshevik daily published in Moscow in 1917-18. p. 117

⁶² *Dyelo Naroda* (People's Cause)—a Socialist-Revolutionary newspaper published in 1917-18. Its name repeatedly changed and the paper was eventually closed down for counter-revolutionary activities. p. 117

⁶³ This refers to a counter-revolutionary revolt by the Czechoslovak army corps formed in Russia of Czech and Slovak prisoners of war before the Great October Socialist Revolution. The revolt was organised by the Entente imperialists with the assistance of Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. It began in May 1918. Acting in close contact with the whiteguards and kulaks, the White Czechs occupied a considerable territory in the Urals, the Volga area and Siberia and restored bourgeois rule there.

The Volga area was liberated by the Red Army in the autumn of 1918, and the White Czechs were finally crushed at the close of 1919. p. 120

⁶⁴ In April 1898, the US imperialists, eager to use the national liberation movement against Spanish colonialists in Cuba and the Philippines to their own advantage, unleashed a war against Spain. They landed troops in the Philippines on the pretext of assisting the Filipinos, who had proclaimed an independent Republic of the Philippines. According to the peace treaty, signed in Paris on December 10, 1898, the defeated Spain ceded the Philippines to the USA. The latter launched treacherous military operations against the Republic in February 1899. In response to stubborn resistance, the US troops started massacring and brutally torturing the peaceful population. Despite their superior numbers and armaments, the interventionists found it hard to conquer the Filipinos who launched guerrilla warfare against the invaders. To achieve their ends, the US imperialists made use of the disagreement among the Filipinos: the bourgeois-ladowning upper crust, frightened by the peasants who combined the struggle for national independence with one for land and better conditions, came to an agreement with the US imperialists. The national liberation movement in the Philippines was crushed in 1901. p. 122

⁶⁵ This refers to the Civil War in the USA, waged from April 1861 to April 1865, between the more economically and socially developed Northern

states and the slave-owning Southern ones. The war was revolutionary and progressive in character on the part of the Northern states. Their victory, brought about by a more progressive social system and the considerable superiority in economic and human resources, paved the way for rapid capitalist development in the USA. p. 128

⁶⁶ *Appeal to Reason*—a newspaper of the American socialists, founded in 1895 in the town of Girard, Kansas.

Eugene Debs' article was printed in the newspaper on September 11, 1915. The heading, cited by Lenin, probably from memory, was: "When I Shall Fight." p. 128

⁶⁷ The *Cossacks*—special army units used by the Russian autocracy to fight the revolutionary movement. p. 130

⁶⁸ The *Berne Conference*—the first postwar conference of the social-chauvinist and Centrist parties held from February 3 to 10, 1919, to renew the activities of the Second International. p. 137

⁶⁹ The *Two-and-a-Half International* (officially known as the International Association of Socialist Parties)—an international organisation of Centrist socialist parties and groups that left the Second International under pressure from the revolutionary masses. Its leaders pursued an opportunist, separatist policy in the working-class movement and strove to use this organisation to counter the growing influence of the Communists among the working masses. The Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals merged into the Socialist Labour International in May 1923. p. 144

Name Index

A

Adler, Friedrich (1879-1960)—Austrian Social-Democrat, one of the theorists of Austro-Marxism; on October 21, 1916 assassinated the Austrian Prime Minister, Count Stürgkh; an organiser of the Two-and-a-Half International (1921-23); later a leader of the Socialist Labour International.—98

Alexander II (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81).—28, 35

Alexander III (1845-1894)—Emperor of Russia (1881-94).—72

Armand, Inessa Fyodorovna (1874-1920)—active member of the Russian and international revolutionary movement; represented the Bolsheviks at international socialist conferences in 1915-16.—70, 75

B

Bebel, August (1840-1913)—outstanding member of the German Social-Democratic Party and the international working-class movement; in the Imperial Diet, refused to vote war credits during the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71).—35, 100

Bismarck, Otto Eduard Leopold (1815-1898)—statesman and dip-

lomat of Prussia and Germany. Effected the unification of German states on the Prussian militarist basis. One of the main sponsors of the Triple Alliance (1882) against France and Russia, while believing the war against Russia to be dangerous for Germany.—20, 26

Bogdanov, A. (real name *Malinovsky, Alexander Alexandrovich*) (1873-1928)—Russian Social-Democrat, doctor, philosopher, sociologist, economist.—76

Borkheim, Sigismund (1825-1885)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany.—114

Boulanger, Georges (1837-1891)—French general, War Minister in 1886-87; headed a chauvinist movement for a war of revenge against Germany, revision of the republican constitution (1875) and dissolution of Parliament.—72

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, and 1815-30).—47

C

Chernov, Victor Mikhailovich (*Gardenin, Y.*) (1876-1952)—a leader and theoretician of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. During the First World War adhered to social-chauvinism, dis-

guising it with Left phrasology; Minister of Agriculture in the bourgeois Provisional Government in May-July 1917; organiser of anti-Soviet revolts after the October Socialist Revolution.—26

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai Gavrilovich (1828-1889)—Russian revolutionary democrat and scientist, writer, literary critic, an outstanding forerunner of Russian Social-Democracy.—127

Chkheidze, Nikolai Semyonovich (1864-1926)—member of the Social-Democratic movement in Russia, a Menshevik leader; a Centrist during the First World War. During the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution took a defencist position; was Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; actively supported the bourgeois Provisional Government; emigrated to France in 1921.—48

Chkhenkeli, Akaky Ivanovich (1874-1959)—member of the Social-Democratic movement in Russia, Menshevik. During the First World War took a social-chauvinist stand. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic Revolution was representative of the bourgeois Provisional Government in the Transcaucasus—48

Clausewitz, Karl (1780-1831)—Prussian general, military theorist, author of a number of works on the history of Napoleonic and other wars—25, 32, 85, 88, 113

D

David, Eduard (1863-1930)—a Right-wing leader of the German Social-Democrats. During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—35

Debs, Eugene Victor (1855-1926)—one of the founders of the Socialist Party of America (1900-

01) and also of the Industrial Workers of the World (1905). During the First World War—an internationalist, conducted propaganda against the USA joining the war.—100, 128

Denikin, Anton Ivanovich (1872-1947)—general in the tsarist army, one of the main organisers of the counter-revolution during the Civil War; commanded the Volunteer Army in 1918; later Commander-in-Chief of the whiteguard armed forces in the South of Russia. Emigrated after being defeated by Soviet troops (March 1920).—146

Duncker, Käthe (1871-1953)—outstanding figure in the German socialist women's movement; an internationalist during the First World War.—40

E

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895)—one of the founders of scientific communism, leader and teacher of the international proletariat, friend and associate of Karl Marx.—25, 26, 33, 35, 47, 65, 71, 72, 73, 76, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118

G

Galliffet, Gaston (1830-1909)—French general; butcher of the Paris Commune of 1871; War Minister in 1899-1900.—66

Gardenin, Y.—see *Chernov, Victor Mikhailovich*

Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807-1882)—Italian national hero, outstanding leader of the Italian revolutionary democrats, a general. Headed the Italian people's struggle for the country's unification.—27, 72

Grimm, Robert (1881-1958)—a leader of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party; a Centrist during the First World War. One of the founders of the Two-and-a-Half International.—63

Guchkov, Alexander Ivanovich (1862-1936)—Russian capitalist, leader of the Octobrist Party of the big landowners and commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution—Army and Navy Minister in the first cabinet of the bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Socialist Revolution fought against Soviet power.—27, 78

Guesde, Jules (Mathieu Basile) (1845-1922)—an organiser and leader of the French socialist movement and of the Second International.

On the outbreak of the First World War, took a social-chauvinist stand, entered the bourgeois government of France.—9, 50, 61, 72-73

Guillaume, James (1844-1916)—Swiss anarchist, member of the First International; expelled in 1872 for separatist activities. In his four volumes on the First International, published from 1905 to 1910, he falsified its history and distorted Marxism; a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—35

H

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German objective idealist philosopher who thoroughly elaborated dialectics, which served as a theoretical source of dialectical materialism.—25

Hervé, Gustav (1871-1944)—French socialist, publicist and lawyer; a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—13

Hyndman, Henry Mayers (1842-1921)—English reformist socialist. An organiser of the Democratic Federation (1881, Social Democratic Federation from 1884) and of the British Socialist Party (1911). In 1916 left the party when the BSP conference

condemned his social-chauvinist attitude to the imperialist war.—9

J

Jaures, Jean (1859-1914)—prominent figure in the French and international socialist movement; opposed militarism and war. One of the founders of the French Socialist Party, with reformist views; assassinated by a chauvinist on the eve of the First World War.—10, 14

Junius—see *Luxemburg, Rosa*

K

Kautsky, Karl (1854-1938)—a leader of the German Social-Democrats and of the Second International; first a Marxist, later rejected Marxism; an ideologist of the most dangerous and harmful variety of opportunism—Centrism (Kautskianism). Editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, theoretical journal of the German Social-Democrats.—21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 35, 50, 62, 65, 67, 106, 137

Kerensky, Alexander Fyodorovich (1881-1970)—Socialist-Revolutionary. During the First World War—a social-chauvinist. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, Prime Minister of the bourgeois Provisional Government and Commander-in-Chief. After the October Socialist Revolution fought against Soviet power.—110, 127, 135, 138

Kievsky, P.—see *Pyatakov, Georgi Leonidovich*.

Kolchak, Alexander Vasilyevich (1873-1920)—tsarist Admiral. In 1918-19, a leader of Russian counter-revolution. Supported by the imperialists of the USA, Britain and France, proclaimed himself Supreme Ruler of Russia and headed the military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and

landowners in the East of Russia. The advance of the Red Army and the growing revolutionary partisan movement led to the collapse of the Kolchak regime.—139, 146

Kollontai, Alexandra Mikhailovna (1872-1952) — professional revolutionary, Bolshevik from 1915. From the beginning of the First World War took an internationalist stand. On Lenin's instructions helped to rally the Left, internationalist elements among the Social-Democrats in the Scandinavian countries and America.—51

Konovalov, Alexander Ivanovich (1875-1948) — big industrialist. Member of the Provisional Government after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution. White émigré after the October Socialist Revolution.—96, 97

Krasnov, Pyotr Nikolayevich (1869-1947) — tsarist general, a leader of counter-revolution following the October Socialist Revolution.—135

L

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864) — German petty-bourgeois socialist, founder of Lassallianism, a variety of opportunism. One of the founders of the General Association of German Workers (1863), which was of major significance for the working-class movement, but Lassalle led it along an opportunist path. Lassalle supported the policy of German unification under Prussian supremacy.—23, 47

Legien, Karl (1861-1920) — German Right-wing Social-Democrat, a leader of the German trade unions, revisionist. A social-chauvinist during the First World War.—45, 50

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich (1870-1924).—19, 59

Lensch, Paul (1873-1926) — Ger-

man Social-Democrat. A social-chauvinist from the outbreak of the First World War.—35, 45

Liebknecht, Karl (1871-1919) — a leader of the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the Left-wing German Social-Democrats; son of Wilhelm Liebknecht. In 1912 was elected to the Imperial Diet. During the First World War opposed support for the imperialist government in the predatory war. On December 2, 1914 he alone voted against war credits in the Diet. One of the founders of the *Internationale* group (later the Spartacus League), of the Communist Party of Germany and one of leaders of the Berlin workers' uprising in January 1919. Was brutally murdered by counter-revolutionaries. — 98, 101, 108, 111

Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900) — prominent member of the German and international working-class movement, one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party.—29, 35

Longuet, Jean (1876-1938) — a leader of the French Socialist Party and of the Second International; grandson of Karl Marx; a pacifist during the First World War. After the October Socialist Revolution opposed armed intervention against Soviet Russia. A leader of the Socialist Labour International.—132

Lubersac, Jean, de — French army officer, Count, monarchist; member of the French military mission to Russia in 1917-18.—125

Luxemburg, Rosa (Junius) (1871-1919) — a leader of the international working-class movement. One of the leaders of the Left wing of the Second International. On the outbreak of the First World War took an internationalist stand. One of the founders of the *Internationale* group (sub-

sequently renamed the Spartacus League) and of the Communist Party of Germany. In January 1919 was murdered by counter-revolutionaries. — 14, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 64, 66

Lvov, Georgi Yevgenyevich (1861-1925)—big Russian landowner, Prince, Constitutional-Democrat. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution was Prime Minister in the bourgeois Provisional Government (March-July 1917). — 77

Lyakhov, Vladimir Platonovich (1869-1919)—tsarist colonel; became famous for the brutal suppression of the national-revolutionary movement in the Caucasus and Iran. — 96, 97

Lysis (Letailler), Eugene—French economist, author of some works on politics and finance. — 73, 88

M

Martov, L. (Tsederbaum, Yuli Osipovich) (1873-1923)—Russian Social-Democrat, a leading Menshevik; a Centrist during the First World War. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution headed the group of Internationalist Mensheviks. After the October Socialist Revolution, opposed Soviet power; emigrated in 1920; one of the founders of the Two-and-a-Half International. — 48

Marx, Karl (1818-1883)—founder of scientific communism, great thinker, leader and teacher of the international proletariat. — 19, 20, 22, 23-28, 33, 35, 36, 47, 48, 70, 71, 72, 73, 104, 117

Mehring, Franz (1846-1919)—prominent member of the German working-class movement, a leader and theoretician of the German Left-wing Social-Democrats. A leader of the revolutionary Spartacus League, played a prominent part in founding the Communist Party of Germany. — 40

Millerand, Alexandre Etienne (1859-1943)—French politician, headed the opportunist trend of the French socialist movement; in 1899 became a member of the reactionary Waldeck-Rousseau government. After his expulsion from the Socialist Party in 1904, a founder of a group of Independent Socialists; President of France from 1920 to 1924. — 27, 73

Milyukov, Pavel Nikolayevich (1859-1943)—Russian politician, historian, publicist, leader of the Cadet Party; Foreign Minister in the first cabinet of the bourgeois Provisional Government in 1917; pursued a policy of continuing the imperialist war to "a victorious conclusion". After the October Socialist Revolution, helped organise the armed intervention against Soviet Russia, later emigrated. — 78, 87, 95, 96

N

Napoleon I (Bonaparte) (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French from 1804 to 1814 and 1815. — 42, 85, 102

Napoleon III (Louis Bonaparte) (1808-1873)—Emperor of the French (1852-70), nephew of Napoleon I. — 26, 28, 35

Nicholas II (Nicholas Romanov, Nicholas the Bloody) (1868-1918)—the last Russian Emperor (1894-1917). — 25, 82, 94, 96, 98, 102, 110, 115, 124

P

Pilsudski, Jozef (1867-1935)—Right-wing member of the Polish Socialist Party; in 1919-22 headed the bourgeois government, brutally suppressed the revolutionary movement. In May 1926 effected a coup d'état and established a dictatorship. — 146

Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich (1856-1918)—eminent mem-

ber of the Russian and international working-class movement; first propagandist of Marxism in Russia; in 1883 founded the first Russian Marxist organisation, the Emancipation of Labour group, in Geneva. After the Second RSDLP Congress in 1903, he adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the opportunists and then joined the Mensheviks. A social-chauvinist during the First World War. Returned to Russia after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution; opposed the socialist revolution, considering that Russia was not ripe for socialism; disapproved of the October Socialist Revolution, but took no part in the struggle against Soviet power.—25, 26, 27, 33, 35, 48, 50, 62

Potresov, Alexander Nikolayevich (1869-1934)—Russian Social-Democrat, a Menshevik leader, a social-chauvinist during the First World War; emigrated after the October Socialist Revolution.—21, 22, 23, 24

Pyatakov, Georgi Leonidovich (*Pyatakov Y., Kievsky, P.*) (1890-1937)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik Party member from 1910. Repeatedly opposed the Leninist Party policy, particularly on the right of nations to self-determination; founded several anti-Party groups. A leader of the Trotskyist opposition; in 1936 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.—52-55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 75

R

Radek, Karl Berngardovich (1885-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat; an internationalist during the First World War, but showed some tendencies towards Centrism. Member of the Bolshevik Party from 1917; opposed the

signing of the Brest Peace Treaty; from 1923 an active member of the Trotskyist opposition; was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity in 1936.—76

Rakovsky, Khristian Georgievich (1873-1941)—an active member of the Social-Democratic movement in Bulgaria, Romania, Switzerland and France from the early 1890s; a Centrist during the First World War; Bolshevik Party member from 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution engaged in Party and government work; later expelled from the Party as a member of the Trotskyist opposition.—51

Rasputin (Novykh), Grigory Yefimovich (1872-1916)—adventurer, enjoying great influence at the court of Nicholas II. As a "sainted elder" and a "prophet" gained the tsar's family's confidence and interfered in affairs of state. Was assassinated by monarchists.—98

Robespierre, Maximilien (1758-1794)—a Jacobin leader during the French Revolution. Executed on July 27, 1794, after the counter-revolutionary coup d'état.—27

Roland-Holst, Henriette (1869-1952)—Dutch socialist, writer. Helped organise women's unions; sided with the Left-wing Social-Democrats of Holland. A Centrist from the outbreak of the First World War; later—an internationalist.—51, 54

Romanov—see *Nicholas II*

Ropshin, V.—see *Savinkov, Boris Viktorovich*

S

Sadoul, Jacques (1881-1956)—French army officer, member of the French Socialist Party, a social-chauvinist. Sent to Russia in 1917 as a member of the French military mission. Became a Communist under the

influence of the October Socialist Revolution.—125

Salandra, Antonio (1853-1931)—Italian statesman, a leader of the extreme Right wing of the Liberal Bloc of industrial monopolies and latifundia. Prime Minister from 1914 to 1916; an initiator of Italy's participation in the war on the side of the Entente.—27

Savinkov, Boris Viktorovich (Roshin, V.) (1879-1925)—a leader of the S.R. Party, of its Combat Organisation. A social-chauvinist during the First World War. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution—a member of the bourgeois Provisional Government; organised counter-revolutionary conspiracies and revolts against the Soviet Republic.—26

Scheidemann, Philipp (1865-1939)—a leader of the extreme Right, opportunist wing of German Social-Democracy. During the November 1918 revolution in Germany was a member of the Council of People's Representatives which, in fact, defended the interests of the bourgeoisie. One of the sponsors of the ruthless suppression of the working-class movement in Germany from 1918 to 1921.—141

Sembat, Marcel (1862-1922)—a reformist leader of the French Socialist Party, journalist. A social-chauvinist during the First World War; Minister of Public Works in the French Government of National Defence from August 1914 to September 1917.—50

Sokolnikov, Grigory Yakovlevich (1888-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat; a Bolshevik Party member from 1905. After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible Party and government posts; later sided with the anti-Party Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc. Expelled from

the Party for anti-Party activities.—105, 106, 107

Souvarine, Boris—French socialist, journalist; a Centrist during the First World War; a follower of Trotsky.—72

Spartacus (d. 71 B.C.)—leader of the greatest slave revolt in Ancient Rome from 74 (or 73) to 71 B.C.—130

Spectator (real name Nakhimson, M. I.) (1880-1938)—economist and publicist. Member of the Bund, Jewish nationalistic organisation, from 1899 to 1921. A Centrist during the First World War.—46

Steinberg, Isaak Zakharovich—a Left Socialist-Revolutionary leader, opposed the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty; left the Council of People's Commissars when the Peace Treaty was ratified.—109

Ströbel, Heinrich (1869-1945)—German Social-Democrat. At the outbreak of the First World War came out against the imperialist war, adhered to the *Internationale* group; in 1916 took a Centrist stand.—40

T

Tereshchenko, Mikhail Ivanovich (1886-1956)—Russian capitalist, sugar manufacturer; Minister of Finance in 1917, later Minister of Foreign Affairs in the bourgeois Provisional Government; supported continuing the war to a "victorious conclusion".—95, 96

Thalheimer, August (1884-1948)—German Social-Democrat, publicist; an internationalist during the First World War.—40

Tolstoy, Lev Nikolayevich (1828-1910)—great Russian writer.—56, 74

Trotsky (Bronstein), Lev Davidovich (1879-1940)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik, opposed the Leninist policy on the war,

peace and revolution. A Centrist during the First World War, joined the Bolshevik Party in 1917. Trotsky did not, however, adopt the Bolshevik stand and continued waging an overt and secret fight against Leninism and the policy of the Party.

After the October Socialist Revolution held several responsible posts. Waged a bitter factional struggle against the Party's general line, against the Leninist programme for building socialism. Trotsky was expelled from the Party in 1927, and deported from the U.S.S.R. in 1929 for anti-Soviet activities. Trotsky was deprived of Soviet citizenship in 1932.—51

V

Veresayev, Viktor Viktorovich (1867-1945)—Russian writer.—117

Vladimir (Romanov, Vladimir Alexandrovich) (1847-1909)—Grand Duke, uncle of Nicholas II.—11

Vodovozov, Vasily Vasilievich (1864-1933)—Russian liberal journalist. In 1917 contributed to the liberal-bourgeois newspaper *Dyen* (Day); opposed the October Socialist Revolution.—95, 96

W

Wiegand, Karl—Berlin correspondent of the American information agency *Universal Service*.—140

Wilhelm II (Hohenzollern) (1859-1941)—German Emperor and King of Prussia (1888-1918).—15, 17, 25

Wilson, Woodrow (1856-1924)—President of the United States (1913-21), supported US participation in the First World War. In January 1918 put forward the imperialist peace programme, known as the *14 points*, which

was aimed at establishing US domination in the world; one of the organisers of armed intervention against Soviet Russia.—128

Wrangel, Pyotr Nikolayevich (1878-1928)—tsarist general, a leader of the counter-revolution in the South of Russia from 1918 to 1920.—146

Y

Yudenich, Nikolai Nikolayevich (1862-1933)—tsarist general; a counter-revolutionary leader after the October Socialist Revolution; in 1919 made two futile attempts to seize Petrograd. Defeated by the Red Army in November 1919.—146

Yuri—see *Pyatakov, Georgi Leonidovich*

Z

Zetkin, Clara (1857-1933)—eminent member of the German and international working-class and communist movement; a founder of the Communist Party of Germany.—40

Zhelyabov, Andrei Ivanovich (1850-1881)—Russian revolutionary, an organiser of the *Narodnaya Volya* (People's Will) Party. Made several attempts on Alexander II's life. Executed for the assassination of Alexander II (March 1, 1881).—27

Zinoviev, Grigory Yevseyevich (1883-1936)—Russian Social-Democrat, lived in emigration from 1908 to 1917; editor of the *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Party's central organ, member of the Central Committee.

After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible posts. Repeatedly opposed the Party's Leninist policy; expelled from the Party for factional activities.—15, 59

Zola, Emile (1840-1902)—French writer.—117

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

В. И. Ленин

О ВОЙНАХ СПРАВЕДЛИВЫХ И НЕСПРАВЕДЛИВЫХ

На английском языке